A COMPENDIUM OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY

by William Burt Pope

Pope's systematic theology establishing divine revelation as the foundation of Christian faith, examining how God reveals Himself through Scripture, miracles, prophecy, and the person of Christ. A comprehensive Wesleyan-Methodist dogmatic theology covering the full scope of Christian doctrine.

34 Chapters

Table of Contents

1. 03. Vol 01 - Definition of Theology
2. 04. Vol 01 - Revelation or the Faith
3. 05. Vol 01 - Inspiration
4. 06. Vol 01 - The Canon: The Divine Rule of Faith
5. 07. Vol 01 - The Existence and Notion of God
6. 08. Vol 01 - The Divine Essence and Perfections
7. 09. Vol 01 - The Triune Name
8. 10. Vol 01 - The Attributes of God
9. 11. Vol 01 - Creation
10. 12. Vol 02 - Origin of Sin in the Universe and on Earth
11. 13. Vol 02 - Nature of Sin
12. 14. Vol 02 - Sin and Redemption
13. 15. Vol 02 - Original Sin
14. 16. Vol 02 - The Divine Purpose of Redemption
15. 17. Vol 02 - The Redemptional or Economical Trinity
16. 18. Vol 02 - The Person of Christ
17. 19. Vol 02 - The Mediatorial Work in its Process
18. 20. Vol 02 - Historical Manifestation of the Redeemer
19. 21. Vol 02 - Names of the Redeemer
20. 22. Vol 02 - The Finished Work
21. 23. Vol 02 - The Atonement in its Results
22. 24. Vol 02 - The Administration of Redemption
23. 25. Vol 02 - The Holy Spirit
24. 26. Vol 02 - The Gospel Vocation
25. 27. Vol 02 - The Preliminaries of Salvation
26. 28. Vol 02 - Historical
27. 29. Vol 02 - The State of Salvation
28. 30. Vol 02 - Christian Righteousness
29. 31. Vol 03 - Christian Sonship
30. 32. Vol 03 - Christian Sanctification
31. 33. Vol 03 - Tenure of Covenant Blessings
32. 34. Vol 03 - Christian Ethics
33. 35. Vol 03 - The Christian Church
34. 36. Vol 03 - Eschatology, or the Last Things

03. Vol 01 - Definition of Theology

Definition of Theology

PRELIMINARIES.

DEFINITION OF THEOLOGY

THEOLOGY PROPER God and Divine Things IN RELATION TO MAN Extent and Limitation IN JESUS CHRIST Relation to Natural Theology, and Earlier Dispensations IN THE CHURCH:

Development and Various Types THEOLOGY A SCIENCE Its Aim, Methods, and Study

CHRISTIAN Theology is the science of God and Divine thing's, based upon the revelation made to mankind in Jesus Christ, and variously systematized within the Christian Church.

(General Definition) All that belongs to the preliminaries of our study may be distributed under the several heads suggested by this definition, which is so framed as to include, first, Theology proper; secondly, its limitation to the relations between God and mankind; thirdly, its essential connection with Christ; fourthly, its characteristics as developed under various influences within the Christian Church; and lastly, its title to the name of a science. The introductory remarks which will be made on these several topics have for their object simply to prepare the mind of the student for what lies before him; and to give a few hints which will all afterwards be expanded in due course.

THEOLOGY.

God is the source and the subject and the end of theology. The stricter and earlier use of the word limited it to the doctrine of the Triune God and His attributes. But in modern usage it includes the whole compass of the science of Religion, or the relations of all things to God. This gives it its unity and dignity and sanctity. It is A DEO, DE DEO, IN DEUM: from God in its origin, concerning God in its substance, and it leads to God in all its issues; His NAME is in it.

1. The only adequate definition of this subject embraces DIVINE THINGS: Logos peri tou Theou kai peri ton Theion. The Supreme, whose being is the first postulate of theology or divinity, declares Himself to be as to His nature incomprehensible and unsearchable. I AM THAT I Amos 1:1-15 is the nearest approach to a definition; it asserts without proving His existence, and that He exists in an essence known only to Himself. The Old Testament asks: Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?2 The New Testament, which brings Him nearer in His Son, represents Him as dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto to search.3 In the profoundest sense He is ever THE UNKNOWN GOD.4 It is His glory that He must conceal Himself. But St. Paul, as a preacher to the Gentiles, nevertheless declares that Unknown God, and in his writings uses two expressive phrases which at once affirm the prerogative and assign the limits of our theology proper. He speaks of the things of God, ta ton Thon, 5 in reference to those mysteries which the Spirit can and will reveal to those who receive Him. And he indicates that even apart from the supernatural revelations of the Spirit what is [or may be] known

of God, to gnwsyon ton Theon,6 is unfolded to man. All that is known is all that may be known: the possible knowledge is the actual knowledge in its successive communications from the light of nature to the light of grace and thence to the light of glory. The thick darkness round about the unsearchable Presence is not absolutely unbroken: the rays that flow from it penetrate every department of true knowledge, especially of this.

1 Exodus 3:14; Exodus 3:2Job 11:7; Job 11:31 Timothy 6:16; 1 Timothy 6:4Acts 17:23; Acts 17:51 Corinthians 2:11; 1 Corinthians 2:6Romans 1:19.

2. There is a sense in which universal theology is concerned simply with the relation of all things to God: if we carefully guard our meaning we may make this proposition include the converse, the relation of God to all things. Relation of course must be mutual; but it is hard in this matter to detach from the notion of relation that of dependence. The Eternal One is the Unconditioned Being. When we study His nature and perfections and works we must always remember that He is His Perfect Self independent of every created object, and independent of every thought concerning Him. But there is not a doctrine, nor is there a branch or development of any doctrine, which is not purely the expression of some relation of His creatures to the Supreme First Cause.

3. Hence every branch of this science is sacred. It is a temple which is filled with the presence of God. From its hidden sanctuary, into which no high priest taken from among men can enter, issues a light which leaves no part dark save where it is dark with excess of glory. Therefore all fit students are worshippers as well as students. In the heathen world there was a true instinct of this. The highest tribute the ancients could pay to their poets and philosophers, from Homer and Hesiod downwards, was to call them Theologoi. Their philosophy was their theology. So in the early Church, when theology put on its perfection, its relation to God was the seal of that perfection: St. John was called the Divine, Ho Theologos, because his writings contained most of the manifestation of the Holy Trinity in its internal and external relations. What has been said of God Himself may be said concerning the theological study of God: He is the centre everywhere of a science which has its circumference nowhere. The remembrance of this must exert its influence upon our spirit and temper in all our studies. Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? or who shall stand in His holy place? He that hath clean hands, and a pure heart.1

1Psalms 24:3-4.

DIVINE THINGS MADE KNOWN TO MAN.

Theology is mainly concerned with the things of God as they are related to man and his destination. This proposition implies the capacity in our nature to receive Divine truth; indicates both the extent and the limits of its range as revealed especially for man; and explains the essentially human character which is impressed on its form and invests it with a profound human interest.

1. Man is in a certain sense the centre of this science. He is specifically the centre of one branch of it, technically called ANTHROPOLOGY, which has to do with his characteristics as a creature formed in the image of God; but, more generally, he is the object around which all revolves. The light of revelation is poured upon the human race; and in its fullness upon it alone. Accordingly the relation of mankind to the Supreme may be said to be one of the definitions of theology. But man is only one insignificant, and yet not insignificant, creature of God. His place in the vast creation, and

the development of his wonderful career in harmony with all other Divine designs, marks out his relation to theology universal. But this general truth must be viewed in two lights: man is the object of all revelation, as it concerns him and his destination; man is the subject of all revelation, as he is its recipient.

(1) Theology is concerned with the destiny of man in the universe. Its first lessons, the opening of the volume of the book, presents him as the head of the creation of God: the history of the origin of all things, and of the slow formation of this world, is only the preface to his introduction as the representative of his Maker upon the earth. His fall and his redemption are blended in one; the whole sequel of revelation is the record of the Divine method of retrieving in the Second Adam what in the first was marred, THE DIVINE IMAGE. The redemption of the human race, and the salvation of individual man, are interwoven into one great economy, stretching from the shutting of the earthly to the opening of the heavenly Paradise. There is not a revelation of God in His three Persons, as the Father, the Son Incarnate, and the Holy Ghost, which is not directly or indirectly connected with the salvation of mankind. Thus theology is simply the system of Divine truth which lies at the foundation of human religion or the spiritual fellowship between man and his Creator.

(2) But the same general principle may be referred to man as the recipient of revelation.

Created in the image of God, he is an intelligent, free and responsible creature, capable of separation from the Divine will and also capable of restoration to the Divine communion. The two first postulates of all theology are the Personality of the Infinite Being and the personality of man His creature. Neither of these is matter of demonstration in the holy oracles: both are assumed or taken for granted everywhere. To renounce either is to annihilate theological knowledge properly so called. Although in the prosecution of this study methods of proving both may be adopted, under the pressure of a necessity imposed on us by the waywardness of human skepticism, yet must we finally and always beg the question here God is a Person who condescends to man; and man is a person who is capable of God.

(3) The objective and subjective relations of man as the centre of theological science meet in the word RELIGION, one of the largest and deepest terms with which we have to do. Its derivation has been much disputed; but the two leading explanations of it may be united for our present purpose. According to Lactantius, vinculo pietatis obstricti deo et RELIGATI sumus, unde ipsa religio nomen accepit, non, ut Cicero interpretatus est, a relegendo. That is to say, the eternal bond which binds man to God is signified by religion, which is therefore the relation of the human creature to the Supreme Creator, as acknowledged and borne witness to in all forms of theological teaching and worship.

Men have never been without a religion, for God has never left Himself without witness1 in any age or land: there have been gods many and religions many, though to us only one God and. one religion. The rejected interpretation of Cicero, however, demands to be heard: qui omnia, quae ad cultum deorum pertinerent, diligenter retractarent et tanquam RELEGERENT, sunt dicti religiosi, ex relegendo. That is to say, the exercise of the human mind in pondering and considering Divine things is signified by religion, which is, as it were, an instinctive and inwrought aspiration of human nature corrected and purified and directed to its highest issues in the true faith. We combine the two when we say that man is the centre of all theology as it is the foundation of all true religion.

1Acts 14:17.

2. Hence the limitation that everywhere meets us. The relations of the vast universe, and of other creatures in it, with God, are included only so far as they concern mankind.

Revelation brings us tidings from without, from the outside universe; and its communications concerning the earlier probation of spiritual intelligences, their division into orders, their interest and agency in the development of the Divine purposes, amount when systematized to a considerable department of revealed truth, to which the name ANGELOLOGY is sometimes given. But it is always their connection with man that regulates the method and the amount of these disclosures. There is strict parsimony as to everything not essential to human destiny: the principle of Least Action is maintained in revelation as in nature. Hence it is obvious that the responsibility of theology, so to speak, is limited to one subject. Those who study it must submit to this restriction.

What is that to thee?1 has its meaning here for all who indulge too much in speculation both as to the past and as to the future. Concerning all other things thou shalt know hereafter: there are many hints and earnests of a more abundant compensatory outpouring of knowledge in due time. Meanwhile this is the answer by anticipation to many objections of the skeptical spirit. We have but one leaf out of an enormous book; its page begins and ends, so to speak, in the middle of a sentence. Hereafter we shall see much more of this book. Now we know in part.2 We know ourselves apart from other creatures and other worlds. Then we shall know as also we are known: we shall know other beings and other worlds as they know us.

1John 21:22, 2 1 Corinthians 13:12.

3. There is an impress upon theology, whether in its Divine records or in its human science, which results from its adaptation to human faculties. We must here take it for granted that man is a creature capable of religion, that is, of communion with God, as a person related to a Person. The Scripture which does not prove that God is does not prove that man is capable of knowing God: both are the fundamental presuppositions of theology. But, reserving the fuller demonstration of this, we must mark that as he is a creature in probation, his knowledge of Divine things is given in probationary forms, testing his character at every point. All is expressly adapted to his limited faculties, and imparted to him in a way suitable to his present stage of existence. God has come down to us in the likeness of men,1 and speaks to them in their own language. As the Rabbins said of the Law, Lex Dei loquitur linguam filiorum hominum, the law of God speaks the language of the children of men. The entire Bible is pervaded by what is called ANTHROPOMORPHISM and ANTHROPOPATHY: the former gives a name to the condescension of God in seeming to take a human form and human attributes; the latter includes also the peculiar affections of man, not excepting some that belong to his infirmity, such as hope and suspense. Not that the reality does not correspond. The Supreme gives us a true revelation of Himself; but it is a revelation that can be understood only in our world, and by us men. Even the angels desire to look into these things; 2 they are learning the secrets of the manifold wisdom of God as known by the Church; 3 but they cannot study them in our language.

1Acts 14:11; Acts 14:21 Peter 1:12; 1 Peter 1:3Ephesians 3:10.

4. As human students of our own truth, we may be assured Sufficient that we shall have full and sufficient guidance. Nothing that it concerns us to know has been or will be hidden from us: what is reserved is reserved for our discipline, as what is revealed is revealed for our instruction. He hath showed thee, 0 man, what is good: 1 this must have its widest application. So also must that other saying, which contains the counterpart: The secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever.2 With what a profound human interest does this invest the whole domain of this sacred knowledge! Our life, our hope, our destiny, our all, is bound up with it: it is the record of our degradation and of our deliverance, of our ruin and of our recovery, of our woes and of our redemption. How great is the dignity of man that he is the centre, in any sense, of such a science! If it is the name of God that gives it its surpassing majesty, that grandeur is reflected upon us.

What is man, that Thou art mindful of him? 3 Our study cannot be conducted aright without a combination of the loftiest triumph and the deepest humility; we must always remember the dignity while we never forget the lowliness of the place we ourselves occupy in it. Approaching the revelation of Him who is our Wisdom, we hear: that no flesh should glory in His presence; 4 receiving that revelation we again hear, he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord. 5 Theology is a light shed upon all the universe; it is the glory of God's creature, man. But this leads us to the eternal secret of our dignity. Our knowledge comes to us through One who is Man and also God; His incarnation in the fullness of time explains the Anthropomorphism of the Old Testament; and it is in Him that the theology of God and the theology of man become one.

1Micah 6:8; Micah 6:2Deuteronomy 29:29; Deuteronomy 29:3Psalms 8:4; Psalms 8:41 Corinthians 1:29-31; 1 Corinthians 1:5Luke 2:32. BY JESUS CHRIST.

Jesus Christ is Himself in Person and in Word the revelation of God. He has confirmed and supplemented Natural Theology, or that which is independent of supernatural revelation. He has consummated the preliminary disclosures of His own earlier dispensations. He has discredited and condemned all teachers and teaching that reject His authority. Hence the science which we study is essentially Christian theology. The postulates of the general proposition will be more fully established hereafter: they are now only stated and assumed.

1. In its technical sense, the term CHRISTOLOGY generally refers to the doctrine of Christ's Person as such in the unity of His two natures; but it may be said that Christology is Theology. He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father. 1 Although He reveals God as the Father who becomes visible in Him, He is in a certain sense the manifestation of the entire Divinity. He is the Mystery of God manifest in the flesh.2 The Old Testament, Behold your God! 3 Ecce Deus tuus! answers to the New Testament, Behold the Man!4 Ecce Homo! Our Lord is the ever-blessed unity of these: for both were spoken expressly of Him. His Person is the compendium of all that is Divine in human things, and in Him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.5 He is the substance of revelation in act and in word. He is Himself the one and supreme Theologian: neither knoweth any man the Father save theSong of Solomon 6:1-13 He is the centre of theology; all its doctrines revolve around Him: I am the Truth. 7 And, as Mediator between God and men,8 making both one, He is in a peculiar sense the bond of perfectness in theology. In Him is its unity, and it is complete in Him. The superscription of the Apocalypse is the superscription of our science as a whole: it is the apokalnpsis 'Iesous Christos, the Revelation of Jesus Christ,9 of Him as its object, from Him

as its source.

1 John 14:9, 2 1 Timothy 3:16; 1 Timothy 3:3Isaiah 40:9; Isaiah 40:4John 19:5; John 19:5Colossians 2:3; Colossians 2:6Matthew 11:27; Matthew 11:7John 14:6; John 14:81 Timothy 2:5; 1 Timothy 2:9Revelation 1:1.

2. The Supreme Revealer confirms and absorbs into His teaching the original revelations of nature: or what is called NATURAL THEOLOGY.

(1.) He presupposes the elements of this natural knowledge. He everywhere appeals to it. But by the mouth of His servant Paul He has given the fullest exposition of what it includes. First, the Apostle speaks of the law written on their hearts, 1 or on the reason of universal man, which is the indestructible evidence of a God in Whose image he was created: for we are also His offspring. 2 Secondly, he appeals to the religious consciousness, or conscience, in man bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another 3 according to the standard written or rather engraven on the reason; to the evidences of the eternal power and Godhead which were clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made; 4 and to a Providence, drawing men, in all ages, to feel after 5 the unknown God of a final revelation. Thus St. Paul, as preacher in the Acts, and teacher in the Romans, traces the broad outlines of the primitive inferior and traditional knowledge of mankind. He is himself pre-eminently the theologian of the finished revelation in Christ, but he indirectly and yet most clearly acknowledges the labors of a certain theology outside of supernatural revelation and preliminary to it.

(2.) The New Teacher confirms and supplements the theology of nature. Our Lord came not to destroy but to fulfill this natural law and these natural prophets. Of these scriptures also He silently says to the searcher: they testify of Me. 6 His coming reveals their imperfection; but His tribute to them, as the basis of His teaching, vindicates their Divine origin. The fanaticism of the Jews cried: Will he go unto the dispersed among the Gentiles, and teach the Gentiles?7 He did both afterwards by His Apostles, and the latter He had done long before. This will hereafter recur at more length.

1 Romans 2:15; Romans 2:2Acts 17:28; Acts 17:3Romans 11:15; Romans 11:4Romans 1:20; Romans 1:5Acts 17:27; Acts 17:6John 5:39; John 5:7John 7:35.

3. Christian Theology is the consummation of its own earlier economies. Christ was the Revealer from the beginning. But His revelations have been given by progressive stages; and now in the end of the world He has gathered the whole into one great system of truth.

We may therefore regard His perfect teaching as the consummation of its preliminary forms. It is the fulfillment of OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY as a vast body of preparatory truth, the ruling design of which is to prepare the way of the Lord. This one complex economy of past revelation is itself divided again into several branches: there is the PATRIARCHALTHEOLOGY, which had in it the earliest broad disclosures of the Divine will, the Gospel before the Law; the MOSAIC THEOLOGY, which is that of the chosen people, and its theocracy, and typical institutes, the Gospel under the Law, and the PROPHETICAL THEOLOGY, which is emphatically the Gospel in the Law. These branches of the earlier teaching were all under the guidance of inspiration: under the Spirit of Christ which was in them.1 They are all presupposed, confirmed, and supplemented and perfected by the New-Testament institution of Christ. This also must again be considered

more fully.

1 1 Peter 1:11 4. New-Testament teaching, which sanctions the religion of nature and the earlier disclosures of truth, both having the same common element of preparation, denounces every independent source of religious instruction. One is your Master, even Christ, kathegetes or didaskalos. 1 He has expressly shut out all others who had come before Him, or who might come after Him: the former, all that ever came before Me, 2 since My appearance, whom the sheep did not hear; 3 the latter, Go ye not therefore after them. He is not more jealous of the honor of His Father than of His own honor. He is the absolute Teacher; But I say unto you 4 interdicts every other: the only supplement of His own words which He admits is that which He Himself gives in the person of the Spirit of truth.

5 And this is intended in the comprehensive saying of the last commission: panta osa eneteilamhn, all things whatsoever I have commanded. 6 1 Matthew 23:8, 2 John 10:8, 3 Luke 21:8; Luke 21:4Matthew 5:22; Matthew 5:5John 16:13; John 16:6Matthew 28:20. The theological systems of religious teaching which are thus condemned are those which have been based upon perversions either of natural or of revealed religion.

(1) The former has assumed many forms, all of them having some common relation to the only truth. There has always been a TRADITIONAL THEOLOGY among men, which, containing vestiges of primitive revelation perverted into error, has been woven into every imaginable form of MYTHOLOGY, or legendary religion, varying with the culture of the nations. These have been connected, especially in the East, with elaborate religious systems which may be called the HEATHEN RELIGIONS, FLOurishing especially in India, China, and Persia when Christ came into the world. PHILOSOPHY, which seeks the first principles of truth in the love of it, but without even professing to find it, has been in every age a human disguise of Divine revelation: anciently deeply religious, almost in every age the expression of a religious sentiment, but in modern times led away by false fundamental principles. The theology proper of a perverted religion of nature is DEISM, in its rather less anti-Christian form THEISM, which retains a God but rejects supernatural revelation, and especially that of Christ.

(2) The perversions of revealed religion have assumed also many forms. The most gigantic is that of RABBINISM, or TALMUDISM, as taught in the writings of the Talmud, the foundations of which were laid in the Judaism of the interval between the two Testaments. Next comes MOHAMMEDANISM, an imposture based upon the Holy Scriptures, but reducing religion back again to the lowest conditions of nature: the strangest admixture of truth and error which history presents. And to them must be added that mass of CHRISTIAN TRADITIONALISM which is identified with the corruption of the Christian Faith. All these are the dark background of the science which the name of Christ sanctifies. We shall meet some of them again and again: and indicate them now only in outline.

5. Christ, the Centre of theology, is its Living Teacher also. As the test of all opinion and faith is the place it assigns to Him, —Whom say ye that I am? being the question that follows Whom do men say that I ?Amos 1:1-15 —so His doctrine cannot be studied effectually save at His feet. By His Spirit He guides His disciples, as the company of its believing students, into all the truth: no longer by a supreme inspiration, but by a secret instruction that gives the full assurance of understanding to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, [which is] Christ, 2 to every believer united to

Himself. Pectus facit theologum, the heart's devotion makes the theologian: this aphorism of Augustine holds good of all whose hearts are true to their Master. They are the holy brethren who are invited to consider the Apostle and High Priest of our confession, [Christ] Jesus. 3 Of the unbelieving Jews our Lord said: Why do ye not understand My speech? even because ye cannot hear My word. 4 But His true disciples, down to the least, can hear His doctrinal word, logos, for they have learned by the Spirit its heavenly meaning as the word of eternal truth; therefore they understand His speech, His lalias, and receive His perfect doctrine. They know Him their Master, and His communications. But He gives His instruction through His Spirit, not only by secret and personal illumination, but through the channels of teaching provided in His Church, which is the pillar and ground of the truth. 5 They receive both the elements and the developments of Christian doctrine as set forth among the people of God; the teachings of God are addressed to the household of faith: prov touv oikeiouv thv pistewv. 6 1 Mark 8:27-29; Mark 8:2Colossians 2:2-3Hebrews 3:1; Hebrews 3:4John 8:43; John 8:51Ti 3:15, 6 Galatians 6:10.

THEOLOGY IN THE CHURCH. The Lord has been pleased to commit His revelation, as finished in the Scriptures, to the keeping of His Church, under the control and supervision of the Holy Spirit. The Scriptures are the rule and standard and test of theology, which in this relation must be regarded as the whole sum of the Church's Christian literature, gradually produced and variously modified: an extension of the term which is absolutely necessary, but requires to be guarded by the proviso that all sound theology is that which has its foundations and evidences in the Word of God. The former part of this proposition must now be assumed: its, discussion is reserved for a future place. Meanwhile, it may be said that there is nothing in theology which does not seek its authority in the Word of God: our science is the arrangement, development, and application of facts and principles given by inspiration. The authoritative volume has from the beginning been lodged in the Church. The early oracles were in the keeping of the covenant people; and the Christian Faith has been delivered unto the saints. 1 The oracle has always had its ark. As the Church was enlarged the Bible was enlarged; but never was the one without the other in the world. Neither, however, without the Divine Spirit, Who has always watched over the growth of a theological literature around the Bible. Besides the fixed utterances of inspiration, the Holy Ghost has His own many other words 2 spoken by men under His more common influences; and Christian men have also theirs, which He overrules and controls. And all these are in their expansion theology, using the term in its widest latitude: a boundless mass of more or less systematized doctrine, the growth of all ages, of all kinds of soil, and of all zones of religious faith. The whole, so far as we have to do with it, is directly or indirectly the produce of the Christian Church: either as the formal arrangement of its own teaching, or as the result of false teaching which it condemns. And we have to consider its various characteristics accordingly.

1 Jude 1:3; Jude 1:2Acts 2:40. But religious truth, as molded within the Church, must be developed according to some laws. First, the requirements of teaching would insure the creation of a large body of various theology. Again, this has assumed specific forms as conformed to different types of doctrine within the Church: giving birth to a great mass of what may be called Confessional theology. And, further, there is a rich development that is governed by the law of adaptation to the internal and external circumstances by which the truth may be surrounded. The idea of evolution is all-pervading in this science; and we are safe in applying it if we remember that there is one law of development peculiar to Scripture, the law of progressive revelation, and

another that governs the human systematization of this.

Divine doctrine is developed in the Bible; in the Church human dogma.

I. Both as teacher and as defender of the Faith the Christian Church was from the beginning under a necessity to create a theology: whether as the teacher of its converts or as their defender against error. Didactic divinity was the necessary expansion of what in Scripture is termed the Apostles' doctrine.1 Its first and simplest form, as seen in the writings of the earliest Fathers, was EXPOSITORY or practical, aiming at the edification of the flock; then followed the CATECHETICAL, for the preliminary instruction of converts or Catechumens in order to baptism, conducted by pastors as Catechists, and formulated in the permanent Catechism; and thus were laid the foundations of all subsequent BIBLICAL theology proper. Defensive assertion of truth was rendered necessary by heresies arising within the community, and by the duty of vindicating the Faith against those without. The latter obligation gave rise to APOLOGETICS in all its branches, called in modern times EVIDENCES: Apology having reference rather to the position of the Christian society as challenged by the world, Evidences belonging rather to its aggressive and missionary character. The former introduced DOGMATIC Theology, taught first in Creeds—the Apostles', the Niceno-Constantinopolitan, and the Athanasian; afterwards in specific expositions of those creeds, and their individual articles: this, as distinguished from Apologetic, is controversial divinity or POLEMICS. In later times, all these branches have been incorporated into the unity of what is called SYSTEMATIC divinity, or the orderly arrangement of the doctrines of revelation, as they are Dogmas fixed in the decisions of the Church, defended against external assaults, and unfolded in the ethics of human duty. This is the normal development of the science within Christendom, and common to all its branches. Every Christian community presents in its own literature more or less systematically all these various forms of fundamental teaching.

1 Acts 2:42.

II. There is a development also which has been conducted according to the law of distinct types of doctrine, issuing finally in what has been already termed CONFESSIONAL theology. This opens a very wide field, where the differences of the several branches of Christendom meet our view. It requires something like an historical survey.

1. Such a survey must include the New Testament itself; but marking the essential difference between its several types of doctrine and those that appear in the Church after inspiration had ceased. It is important to have a clear conception of this. The sum of Scriptural teaching is the combination of many elements which the Holy Ghost fashioned into unity. As the history of the redeeming government of mankind runs on, the gradual evolution of doctrine generally and of individual doctrines runs on with it; and as all events converge to the fullness of time so all doctrines converge to the fullness of truth.

Multiplicity and variety are for ever tending to simplicity and unity. The preparatory teaching of the Old Testament and the perfect teaching of the New are one in the unity of prophecy and fulfillment. The same may be said of the predictions of the Gospels before the Pentecost, and their accomplishment afterwards. And there are different types of doctrine in the Apostolic circle. St. John, St. Peter, St. James, St. Paul contribute their several distinct exhibitions of Christian truth, each of which is sharply marked off from its fellows, while all conspire to the unity of the faith. 1

The first Three received each his special charisma or gift, and represented the Savior's teaching as given to them in its elements by His own lips, before and after the resurrection, and as subsequently expounded to them by the Holy Spirit, according to the Lord's promise. St. Paul was added to the company; he derived his teaching, according to his own testimony, directly from the Risen Savior, who elected the future Apostle from a Rabbinical school, and gave him a specific revelation of the scheme of the Gospel. In one of the Epistles which contain the fullest exhibition of what is new in the evangelical system he says: for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.2 It is most obvious that the method of the Inspiring Spirit was to complete the Christian revelation on the principle of a series of converging developments, the last and highest of which were committed to St. Paul and St. John. This fact will meet us again; it will be our main guide in the Biblical exposition of theology. Meanwhile, it must be remembered that these developments ended with the perfected revelation. Divine doctrine then ceased, and human dogma then began its course. The unity of New-Testament doctrine is perfect. The Apostle Paul, who seems to introduce so many new elements into his teaching that he is claimed by very opposite parties as the real founder of Christian theology, is the most strenuous of all in asserting that unity, and in denouncing every tendency to divide the Christian Faith into several types. Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment .. . Is Christ divided?

1 Ephesians 4:13; Ephesians 4:2Galatians 1:12; Galatians 1:31 Corinthians 1:10-13.

2. In Christian history the case is different. Christendom soon was partitioned into provinces: the period of perfect unity in theological teaching was very brief. This is not the place to discuss the moral character of this fact: it is with the fact alone we have to do, and with that only in a preliminary way.

(1) During the first six hundred years, the Patristic age proper, the unity of the Faith was expressed by the Ecumenical Creeds: the APOSTLES', which gradually expanded the Baptismal Formula, the NICENE, which introduced a more theological definition of the Holy Trinity in Unity, the ATHANASIAN, which still more fully expanded this, and added to it the precise definition of the Incarnation. Scarcely were the Three Creeds lodged in the universal Faith than the first division of Confessional theology took place: that between the ORIENTAL and the WESTERN Confessions. Beginning with the difference of a word, the insertion of the FILIOQUE to express the procession of the Spirit from the Son as from the Father, the breach wore on, and the two Theologies have had ever since their marked types: that of the East contemplative, mystical, unprogressive, and teaching rather by symbol than by creeds; that of the West abounding in analysis, always progressive, and developing every truth to its utmost issues. The Greek or Oriental Creed, mainly though not exclusively represented by the Orthodox Church of Russia, holds to the decisions of the seven (Ecumenical Councils from 325 to 787, the Nicene Creed being its basis. Since the Reformation it has issued several Confessions, that of Peter Mogila in 1643, the Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem 1672, the Catechism of Philaret, sanctioned in 1839. Oriental divinity has many points of specific distinction from that of the West. From the Roman Catholic it differs by rejecting the doctrine of the Papacy, by some modifications of the Seven Sacraments, by denying the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin, by circulating the Bible in the Vernacular, and, as a consequence of the first of these differences, by the assertion of its own absolute supremacy as

the only orthodox and true representative of Christianity on earth Classing Romanism among the schisms and heresies as the eldest born among them, it nevertheless agrees with Rome in the great bulk of its doctrines, and has no affinity with Protestantism save in its rejection of an infallible human authority and the consequent possibility of its own reformation.

(2) The Romanist and Protestant types of theology have divided the Western world for three centuries: united as they undoubtedly are in many of the most fundamental verities, their differences touch almost every essential topic in the administration of redemption and the presence of Christ in His Church. Those differences will meet us only too often: meanwhile it is enough to say that each type of doctrine is developed into a large body of theology. The basis of Romanism was until lately the TRIDENTINE symbols and decrees and canons, or the solemn sanction given by the Council of Trent in the middle of the sixteenth century to the dogmas which had been growing up in the mediaeval times, and were formulated in opposition to Protestantism. In the present century the VATICAN decisions on the Immaculate Conception, 1854, and Papal Infallibility, 1870, have been added to the Tridentine decrees and Roman Catechism of the era of the Reformation. PROTESTANTISM as such, that is, the general system of doctrine which derived its name from the protest against Rome, has many subdivisions, and its confessions are many. Historically considered, these divided into two at the Reformation: the LUTHERAN and the REFORMED; the chief expositors of the former having been Luther and Melanchthon, and of the latter Calvin and Zwingli. These are one in their adhesion to the three ancient Creeds, but specially in the restoration of Holy Scripture to its supreme place as the standard of faith, in the vindication of the fundamental doctrines of grace which in the ancient Creeds had not sufficient prominence, and in the establishment of the Scriptural view of a sinner's personal relations to Christ. But they differ in other respects: mainly in that Lutheran Theology is more deeply sacramental, and the Reformed is pervaded by the revived predestinarianism of Augustine. The chief standard of Lutheran doctrine is the Augsburg Confession of 1530, with Luther's Catechisms of 1529, and the Formula of Concord, 1577. The chief Reformed Standards were the Helvetic Confession of 1564, the Heidelberg Catechism of 1563, with the various Confessions of France, Belgium, and Scotland. The Re-formed doctrine has spread more widely, and is now represented by many formularies, among which may be classed the Thirty-nine Articles, and more distinctly the Westminster Confession, which unites most of the English-speaking communions of Calvinism.

(3) In the beginning of the seventeenth century the ARMINIAN, or rather REMONSTRANT, Confession arose in Holland, under the direction of James Harmen, Arminius as a protest against what .has been called, from its second founder, CALVINISM. The supreme principle of this latter type of doctrine is the Absolute Sovereignty of God: its best representative is the Westminster Confession. The Armenian type has for its principle the universality of the benefit of the Atonement and the restored freedom of the human will as an element in the doctrine of the Divine decrees. The Remonstrance presented by the followers of James Arminius contained five articles, of which the following is the substance: that God elected to salvation, or to reprobation, those whose faith or whose final disbelief He foresaw; that Jesus Christ died for all, but only believers receive the benefit; that repentance and renewal are of the Spirit's operation; that the grace which effects this may be finally resisted; that the question of a necessary final perseverance must be left undecided. These Five Points, the last of which was afterwards made more explicit, have been the foundation of Arminianism in Holland, and in England, where it leavened theological thought to a

great extent. In the Revival of the last century the original Methodists were distinguished from the followers of Whitefield as Arminians. But the immediate successors of Arminius declined from sound faith in some particulars; and in its own country the system is deeply tinctured with Socinianism and Rationalism.

(4) All these Confessional types are exhibited in the systematic teachings of the larger communions into which the modern Church is divided. Nor are there any other, unless a UNITARIAN type is admitted: there was after the Reformation a Socinian Confession; but that, as a Confession, has vanished, scarcely any trace of its peculiarities being found in modern Unitarianism, which has its most productive field in America, and can scarcely be distinguished from pure Theism. Nor can there be said to be an ECLECTIC or LATITUDINARIAN system: for these words apply to no one particular type of Christian doctrine.

(5) METHODIST theology, which has spread during the last century over a very wide area of Christendom, is Catholic in the best sense, holding the Doctrinal Articles of the English Church, including the Three Creeds, and therefore maintaining the general doctrine of the Reformation. It is Arminian as opposed to Calvinism, but in no other sense. Its peculiarities are many, touching chiefly the nature and extent of personal salvation; and with regard to these its standards are certain writings of John Wesley and other authoritative documents.

III. There is a third view to be taken of development in the theology of the Christian Church: having reference to the form it has in all ages taken from external circumstances. This also will be best seen in such a brief review as may serve to indicate the importance of the study of the ecclesiastical history of doctrine or dogma, and, at the same time, prepare the way for those historical summaries which will be given under the several heads of the following course.

1. In the Patristic Church—including the ante-Nicene and post-Nicene periods down to Gregory, A.D. 600—there were schools of theological thought, which represented almost all the later tendencies. For instance, Asia Minor and Antioch, Alexandria, and North Africa were severally centers of three very distinct kinds of teachings: the first, more faithful to Scripture and Apostolical tradition; the second, blending philosophical speculation, allegorical interpretation, and the mystical element with its Christianity; and the third, hard, real, and dialectic. The early writers in these distinct schools betray their influence in every age, and in all their views of Christian doctrine, and the same influence extends downwards, more or less, through subsequent times. These schools reign still without the names.

2. During the earlier part of the Middle Ages, superstition molded tradition into forms of doctrine that more and more diverged from the Scriptural standard. This was a period, however, of comparative stagnation, as contrasted with the luminous activity of the post- Nicene age and with the deep theological devotion of the Schoolmen beginning with Anselm about 1100. The Scholastic divinity in the universities of Christendom wrought up the materials it inherited into systematic forms, which carried dialectic subtlety and philosophical speculation to their highest point. By the toil of many indefatigable minds it laid the foundation of the complete system of Roman Catholicism as formulated in the Council of Trent; while, at the same time, it transmitted its methods to Protestantism, the first century of which almost rivaled the work of the medieval doctors in analytical severity and completeness. Whatever deductions may be made from the value of its results, the Christian Church owes very much to the industry and devotion of the

Schoolmen. Systematic theology had its origin in their labors.

3. Through all these, however, struggled the Mystical spirit, which controlled a large part of the Scholastic theology, and penetrated every branch of the Christian Church, influencing the doctrines of each by turns. Its law of development is the independent teaching of God in communion with the human spirit: independent, first, as without the external means of grace, and, secondly, as given to the individual apart from all others. The theology of every period, and of every region of Christendom, has received the impress of this law working lawlessly: its operation has touched Pantheism at the one pole, and at the other merely imparts a mystical coloring to Christian doctrine and devotion. Consequently, it is impossible to characterize Mystical theology as one distinct whole; and still more evidently is it wrong to brand it with indiscriminate condemnation. Its earliest Christian representative, the pseudo-Dionysius, teaches with all his errors a sublime doctrine of the Supreme and of man's communion with Him; and the purest spirit of self-renouncing consecration pervades the writings of Scotus Erigena and other Mystics who held the leading doctrines of the Christian Faith. The Theologia Germanica, a work which transmitted to modern times the ancient Mysticism, was made by Luther almost one of the textbooks of the Reformation. From that time downwards Mystic devotional theology reappears in every region of Christendom. Romanism has had its several types in Spain, France, Italy, and Germany; and its Mystical writers, apart from their unevangelical and quietistic errors, carry devotion into a very high region. Every community of Protestantism has had its representatives both of the sound and of the unsound Mysticism. In some it has passed into a transcendental theosophy, Jacob Behmen being their expositor; in others, into a fanatical independence of external revelation, and indifference to the common fellowship of the Church; in others into a visionary religion of intuitional sentiment and feeling. But its healthiest manifestations have been simply a tribute to the pure Mysticism of the New Testament; a protest against the mere form and externality of godliness; and the true expression of all that is high and unearthly in communion with God.

4. In every age, but especially in these last times, theology in the Church has been influenced by a tendency the opposite of that of Mysticism: the spirit of Rationalism, which makes the human understanding the measure of the truth it accepts. Rationalism is either philosophical or critical: the former has aimed to recast Christian doctrine, and make it the manifold expression of its own ideas; the latter has been destructive, eliminating from the faith everything that human reasoning cannot explain. In both these forms it has widely influenced the development of Christian theology, though both may be said to carry their doctrine to a region altogether outside of Christendom. The term Rationalism, as signifying one of the elements that mould religious thought, may be restricted to the latter meaning. It is the spirit which perpetually labors to make the truths of revelation acceptable to the human understanding. In a very different sense from that of the Apostle, it testifies only that which it has seen: seen with the eye of reason alone.

Accepting the Christian Faith as a whole, it claims to give a good account of it to the intuitions and judgments of men; but this at the expense of all that is transcendent, mysterious, and past finding out in the ways of God with mankind.

5. The other aspect of Rationalism may more appropriately be termed Speculation in theology. Speculation starts from certain a priori determinations which thought finds in itself as the

necessary and primary ground of all being and thinking. It fixes upon its point of observation, and speculates or regards attentively the whole field of possibilities from that point of view. Hence it constructs its own philosophy of religion from subjective principles. It aims to understand Christianity as the expression of eternal laws governing the universe. The result has been an ever-shifting variety of theological conceptions of the sum of things. The characteristics of each system have been marked by some primary category or law of thought to which all is reduced: in that of Scotus Erigena it was the idea of Nature uncreated, creating and created; in Leibnitz the Monad; in Spinoza, the one eternal Substance, with its attributes of thought and extension; in German transcendental philosophies, all more or less theological, the idea of the absolute, the Ego and non-Ego, the Idea, Each makes the Christian revelation the eternal and necessary expression of its own self-gendered thought. But another application of the term speculative in relation to theology requires to be mentioned: that which simply implies a disposition to push inquiry into the fringe of thick darkness which encompasses the circle of every revealed doctrine, and to fill up the chasms in the system of truth at every point. It is the undue exercise of imagination in the religious domain; and it differs from Rationalism only in this, that it does not reduce faith to knowledge, as if we must perfectly know in order to believe, but rather strives to include within the sphere of knowledge what is left to the acceptance of naked faith. With speculative theology, however defined, we ought to have but little to do.

6. Finally, there are healthy developments in theology, and especially in some branches of it, which are guided by the general advancement of human affairs. With the progress of human culture theology progresses. In its relation to science, philosophy, learning, and civilization generally, it both gives and receives. It absorbs the good influences, and counteracts the evil, of the times. It begins, as it were, afresh in every land in which it is planted and grows with its growth. The tree is everywhere the same, and its fruit the same; but its development varies with the influences of soil and culture. In every Christian Church theology is, at this moment, undergoing as a science manifold and obvious improvement; and each community contributes its part to the general advance. But this leads to the last branch of our general proposition.

THEOLOGY SCIENTIFIC.

Christian Theology is the systematic arrangement of the truths pertaining to the revelation of God. It may lay claim to the character of a science: its aim is scientific, as it is the basis of practical religion: its methods also are scientific, in the best and only legitimate sense. But theological science has peculiarities which distinguish it from all others, and must be kept in view by every student.

I. The aim of theology is to exhibit the grounds and principles, the connection and harmonies, the results and applications, of the facts of revelation. In common with every science, it obeys the law of the human mind, which demands that the materials of its knowledge should be inductively generalized and systematically arranged; and, in common with every science, it arranges its materials for use and practical application.

Theology is the science, and Religion is the art. The two derivations of the word RELIGION—from Relegere, or Religare—blend, as we have seen, in making it the practice of the duties that flow from man’s relation to God. Whether more subjective, according to the former, or more objective, according to the latter, it is, and has ever been, the art or practice of the Divine service. The

reasons, obligations, laws, arguments, and results of this service are set forth in the science which is its foundation. And, as religion is from God, so also is theology. The Bible is as full of the science as it is of the art of religion. It will be seen hereafter that there is a distinction between Biblical and Systematic theology; but that distinction does not involve the exclusion of theological science from the Bible: almost every treatise in it refuses to allow this. Wherever man's duty to God is taught, there must be the establishment and enforcement of its grounds; and Holy Scripture encourages both the theoretical and the practical study of Divine truth.

II. The methods of theology are scientific. It observes, tests, and arranges facts and makes generalizations; it uses both the inductive and deductive processes of argument; it depends upon the same primary laws of thought upon which those processes rest; and it sets out, as all legitimate human inquiry must set out, with a firm faith in certain truths which lie behind experience, being inwrought into the fabric of our minds: such as the primary law of causation and all that it involves, and the validity of those laws of belief which are innate. But the facts of our science are gathered from regions some of which are thought to be interdicted to scientific observation. There is the sacred deposit of original truths in the constitution of man's nature. There are the economies of Creation and Providence. There is the boundless storehouse of the Word of God; and there are the innumerable testimonies of common experience, of which Scripture is the test, while they confirm the Scripture. Strictly speaking, all these regions of observation are one, inasmuch as every element of religious consciousness, and every lesson of the external universe, is wrought up into the fabric of Divine revelation. We cannot take a step further without the assurance that these are legitimate fields of observation, the facts or phenomena of which are as real as the facts with which physical science has to do.

Theological science is dissipated at once if this is denied. Supposing it granted, then there remains only the careful, honest, and religious observance of the accepted laws of reasoning. The result, whether by analysis or synthesis, is the scientific presentation of each doctrine and class of doctrine and the entire compass of theology. In this way, that is by the rigorous processes of induction and deduction, systematic theology arrives at a clear and distinct apprehension of every article of the Faith. For instance, its doctrine of sin is the result of a wide and exhaustive examination of a large number of testimonies in Scripture and in experience which force conviction on the mind that one, and one only, theory can account for all the facts. The same may be said of its doctrine of the Person of Christ, which is inductively established by a comparison of many passages, none of which individually contains a formal statement. Of this we shall have manifold other illustrations as we proceed.

III. Hence a distribution of the truths of revelation in systematic forms, which combine into a complete encyclopedia of theological science. A comprehensive view of this divides it into Biblical, Historical, and Dogmatic; each of these, however, more or less penetrating the others, and all combining to form what may be called Systematic divinity.

1. BIBLICAL THEOLOGY, in its widest meaning, includes the criticism and study of the text of Scripture; its construction as a whole; the laws of exegesis and their application, or Hermeneutics; its archaeology, geography, and history; and all that belongs to the Introduction to the Bible. More restricted in meaning, it is the arrangement of the theology of Scripture in its own terms and according to its own laws of development and classification. In this sense it is the foundation of all

theology properly so called: every doctrine, as will be seen, having its own and proper Biblical development.

2. HISTORICAL THEOLOGY embraces ecclesiastical history in its whole compass, or the history of the kingdom of God within and without the Scripture; including all that belongs to the Church, its antiquities, ceremonies, and jurisprudence, but especially the progress and development of Christian doctrine through the ages of controversy and formation. It is in this latter sense that we shall use the term: endeavoring to present every specific article of the Faith in its evolution in ecclesiastical systems.

3. DOGMATIC or DOCTRINAL THEOLOGY includes both the doctrine and ethics of Christianity in their scientific arrangement, with their apology and defense; in it doctrine as taught in Scripture, and dogma as taught in the Church, are one.

4. SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY may be said, more or less, to include all these: it takes the system of doctrine as its basis, but illustrates it from history, and verifies it by Scripture.

It has this peculiarity, that, while the other three may be independent of any particular standard, every work on systematic theology more or less bears the impress of one confessional stamp.

5. Of this fact the present course will be an illustration: exhibiting the compass of Divine truth, whether as presented in Scriptural forms, or as molded by ecclesiastical development, or as dogmatically stated in its results. It will first treat of the Christian Religion, and of its Documents as the DIVINE RULE OF FAITH: including the topics of Revelation, Inspiration, Canon, with such exhibition of the credentials or evidences of the Faith as are consistent with the strictly dogmatic character of our course. This is the necessary introduction to the supreme doctrine concerning GOD: His Being, Essence, Names, and Attributes. The consideration of these subjects will lead to the relations of GOD AND THE CREATURE. Then follows the doctrine concerning SIN: its origin, nature, and universality. The MEDIATORIAL MINISTRY OF JESUS CHRIST, His Person, and His Work, as objectively finished on earth and in heaven, will next demand prolonged attention, leading to the ADMINISTRATION OF REDEMPTION, including Personal Salvation, the Ethics of the Gospel, and the Institutions of the Christian Church. All must needs be closed by the doctrines pertaining to the LAST THINGS.

IV. It is of great importance that the mind should be imbued at the outset with a sense of the possibility and the advantage of a well-articulated system. In the organic unity of Christian truth every doctrine has its place in some cycle of doctrines, while all the lesser systems revolve around their common centre. And it is one of the fruits of theological study to enable the student to locate every topic at once. But not only so. There are rich and profound harmonies among these truths; and every doctrine, having its proper place, has also its relations to almost every other: the quick discernment of these relations is another fruit of devout and earnest inquiry. Putting the two together, the high aim of the proficient in this study should be to discover all the affinities and connections of the truths of the Christian system. It may be objected that such scientific precision in the definitions and demarcations of doctrine is out of keeping with the free spirit of Christian theology. It is customary to point to the rich and irregular luxuriance of Scripture. But the Scripture is altogether on the side of order. Some parts of it are as systematic as they could be made; and none are without system. It has, and bids us have and hold, the ugiainontwn, the form of sound

words. 1 St. Paul distinguishes between the words of faith and the words of good doctrine, 2 which he exhorts Timothy to combine in their unity. Of course, the effort to systematize must be governed by a higher aim, and guarded against the danger to which it is peculiarly exposed. Theology, the city of God, is built, as it were, upon seven hills, which are the great doctrines that may be discerned to be fundamental. These several hills of the Lord are not sharply separated from each other, but throw out their spurs in all directions, making it hard to show where one department of truth ends and another begins. To maintain the distinctions without marking them too mechanically is the aim of sound theological science.

1 2 Timothy 1:13; 2 Timothy 1:21 Timothy 4:6.

V. It remains only to mark the sacred peculiarities of this study. True as it is that its methods are the same which are employed in the inductive sciences, it is also true that its materials are partly or mainly collected in a region which merely human science cannot penetrate, and where a special kind of demonstration is alone attainable. It is wrong to place theology on a level with the inductive sciences: it is either below them, or above them, or both, according to the spirit in which it is viewed.

1. There is a sense in which the entire round of theological truth is matter of faith: even those facts which belong to the consciousness of every man are connected with great verities that are delivered to faith from the invisible world, Now, faith is the inward assurance of things not seen, and makes the materials of theology as real and certain as the things that physical science has to deal with. But that faith is not altogether common to man; it is connected with certain moral conditions; and, to those who have it not, theology in every form is only an incomprehensible pseudo-science. They retort upon it its own words, and brand it as science falsely so called. 1 Not that they entirely reject the study of Divine things: to them also there is a Science of Religion, or of the superstitions and quasi-spiritual delusions of mankind. To those who believe it is the truest, most comprehensive, and not least exact of all the sciences; and it is not their fault if it remains, nevertheless, a region of esoteric mysteries into which they alone are initiated.

1 1 Timothy 6:20.

2. Mystery is everywhere in this knowledge: its simplest elements are things unsearchable by the faculties of man. This is to some extent true of all other sciences; they all have their mysteries, in both the Scriptural senses of the term: things brought to light that have been long hidden, and things unsearchable, the signs of which only are seen. The latter always wait on the former; when the mystery ceases to be a matter reserved from knowledge, it ceases not to be a matter reserved from reason. This is true of the impenetrable things of nature; it is a mistake to think that when science has discovered the laws that govern the wonderful phenomena with which it deals, the mystery ceases. The simplest elements of every department of knowledge are things unsearchable by human faculties. Supposing scientific research to be successful in penetrating every secret of nature, so far as to find the secondary cause of every effect, there is still a large residuum over which it broods, waiting for light which probably will never come. But the theological mystery is confessedly great. 1 Every doctrine, however bright and blessed in itself, is compassed about with thick darkness; every page and every line of its record " exit in mysterium." There are, and will ever be, great antitheses or, as men call them, contradictions in thought which our limited capacity is unable to reconcile. Metaphysical thinking is compelled to leave these antinomies

unsolved wherever the finite and the infinite meet. Our science also has its speculative region, into which reason soars, but the logical understanding cannot follow. Moreover, and finally, it has revelations to deal with which appall the minds which they baffle: the dread and awful truths which are its dark side, having their reflections in human experience and the ordinary course of nature, but not the less a stumbling block on that account. All these are the cross of theology, which to itself is its glory, to unbelieving man its reproach.

1 1 Timothy 3:16.

3. Like every other science, but in a peculiar sense, theology has much in it of the " petitio principii." It assumes many irreducible first axioms. The consciousness of self, the consciousness of a world not self, the consciousness of God neither self nor the world, we may seek to demonstrate, but they are postulated in the demonstration. It will appear, as we proceed, how often and in what various ways theology seems, in its general credentials and in its defense of every doctrine, to argue in a circle. This is a necessity of which it need never be ashamed, and no truly philosophical or scientific mind will charge this as an offence.

4. In common with all the sciences, theology has its phraseology of conventions: partly of scriptural precedent or suggestion, partly of human appointment. Conventional terms are necessary in all knowledge: the symbols of ideas once settled are, and ought to be, unchangeable. The systematic arrangement of Divine truth requires them, and has enlisted them in great variety. It has its precise technical terminology, the fixing of which has been the result of sound inductive processes, and the accurate maintenance of which gives its precision to our study. Revelation, Inspiration, Scripture, Faith, Trinity, Substance, Person, are instances of terms which have their established conventional meaning. The importance of this may be illustrated in the case of two of these terms in particular. Inspiration is a word in common use to signify an influence breathed upon or flowing into the mind from any external source, as opposed to its own inherent operations: hence it has a current philosophical and literary application. In religious matters it also signifies any influence or energy of the Holy Spirit in the awakening of spiritual feeling. But it has in theology a conventional meaning, which is limited to the direct and specific discipline of the Inspiring Spirit preparing the writers of Scripture for their task; and to that use of it the term is strictly to be appropriated. Again, the word Person has a variety of applications. It signifies generally the ground of personality, or of independent, conscious, responsible action. But it has in theology a specific relation both to the doctrine concerning God and to the doctrine concerning Christ. As to the former, it is used conventionally to distinguish the Three Persons in the unity of the one Divine essence. The personal God is known to us as Three Persons; and the term which has been long established stands simply as the symbol of an incomprehensible mystery. As to the latter, the indivisible Person of Christ signifies the result of the union of His two natures. The conventional term has here another and distinct use, being again the symbol of a mystery equally unfathomable with that of the Triune personality. The same term has its different conventional use in these two supreme subjects: and its applications must be remembered and respected. But every department has its own specific theological vocabulary. They will defend themselves as we proceed: meanwhile, the student should be impressed with their importance, making it a law of his study to define them carefully and hold them fast tenaciously.

5. Theological science, in conclusion, has a Divine sanction, influence, and control, which no other can claim. There is a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them under-standing in every department of knowledge. But in theology, which seeks in all truth its relation to God and eternity, there is the guarantee of a special guidance of the Holy Spirit of God. His witness is not given only to the personal acceptance of the believer; it is a testimony to the doctrine on which his experience rests.

Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given us of God. 1 This declaration of St. Paul refers to nothing less than the whole compass of theology, as it unfolds the deep things of God; and, what is more, it assures us that the sufficient knowledge of these deep things is not the prerogative of inspired Apostles only, but is the common privilege of all who receive the Divine Spirit as a Teacher. The theological student who does not imprint this truth on his heart at the outset goes on his perilous way without the strongest incentive for the encouragement of his labors. In this study the Holy Ghost more than blesses the diligent mind: He directs its pursuits, shapes its conclusions, and sanctifies its reasoning. The first condition of the successful pursuit of this science is the submission of the reason to the teaching of the only wise God our Savior.2 In the Holy Scriptures this is laid down as a primary axiom. No one who despises or neglects it will ever be more than a learner, ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth; 3 but St. Paul, using the same strong word for a perfect experimental apprehension, says elsewhere that God will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth, eiv epignwsin alhqeiav. 4 The intellectual and spiritual perception of truth which is denied in the one case and affirmed in the other is expressed by a phrase which the Apostle never uses save for the highest certitude of knowledge. The sum of all is that no one who steadfastly relies on the Heavenly Teacher will fail to reach the full assurance of understanding, 5 in relation at least to that knowledge which is all that is essential to man, THE MYSTERY OF GOD, even CHRIST.

1 1 Corinthians 2:12; 1 Corinthians 2:2Jude 1:23; Jude 1:32 Timothy 3:7; 2 Timothy 3:41 Timothy 2:4-5Colossians 2:2.

Chapter 2

04. Vol 01 - Revelation or the Faith

Revelation or the Faith THE DIVINE RULE OF FAITH.

REVELATION OR THE FAITH REVELATION AS GIVEN BY GOD

General; Its Definitions

Special: Its Purpose and Sphere THE CHRISTIAN FAITH AS RECEIVED BY MAN FAITH AND REASON CREDENTIALS OF THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION ITS RESPONSE TO EXPECTATION OF MANKIND:

Preparations in Human Nature;

Correction of Natural Religion;

Perfecting of Former Revelations DIVINE ATTRIBUTES IN REVELATION: The Supernatural Order

MIRACLES Nature of Evidence;

Tests

PROPHECY

Laws;

Tests;

Value as Credential

INSPIRATION The Divine Hand in Scripture CHARACTER OF CHRIST THE REVEALER HIS SUPREME CLAIM AND ITS JUSTIFICATION HYPOTHESES CONCERNING CHRIST INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY ITS AVOWED AIM AND PRETENSIONS ITS FULFILMENT OF ITS MISSION ITS PERSISTENCE AND PERMANENCE:

Early Spread;

Conflict with Judaism;

Heathenism;

Natural Religions;

Scientific Thought;

Gradual Victory; THE HOLY GHOST AS THE ABIDING INTERNAL CREDENTIAL

SUMMARY

CHRISTIAN Theology, as the science of Christianity, the one, perfect, and only Religion, is based upon the documentary records of God's revelation of Himself and of His will in Christ Jesus. Of necessity, therefore, its first inquiry should be directed to the nature and authority of its Sacred Writings, which contain at once the historical development and the finished result of the Divine revelations to mankind. One proposition gives here the summary of the whole truth. The Holy Scriptures are the Divine Rule of Faith: a statement which, unfolded, opens three departments of investigation. First, they are the documents and the depository of the Christian Revelation, or the Christian Faith, which is the consummation of all religious knowledge. Secondly, they are Divine in their origin: the product of the Holy Spirit's inspiration. Thirdly, they are the Rule of the Faith, as forming a body of canonical Scriptures, regulating forever the doctrine and teaching of the Christian Church. Hence we derive the three great words which are the superscription of the whole body of dogma concerning the written oracles of God: Revelation, Inspiration, and Canon.

REVELATION OR THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.

These two terms may be studied as counterparts, and in some sense as synonymous. The Christian Faith is the perfected Revelation, and the perfected Revelation is the Christian Faith; each and both being coincident, generally speaking, with the Christian Scriptures. But Revelation refers them to God the Revealer; Christian Faith regards them as received by man. It will be useful to make this distinction govern our treatment of the whole subject. Human faith and Divine revelation are DOUBLE ONE AGAINST THE OTHER. 1What God is pleased to make known, man's acceptance makes his Faith. 1 Sir 42:24.

REVELATION. The term Revelation signifies in its last and highest theological meaning the unveiling or disclosing of God's redeeming purpose to mankind. This definition distinguishes it from more general manifestations of the Supreme Being, and gives to the Christian revelation its distinctive character, as including all other forms of Divine teaching and adding its own supplement and consummation. It is at once the most elementary and the-most comprehensive word of our theological system.

REVELATION GENERAL.

Revelation, taken in its broadest sense, includes every manifestation of God to the consciousness and perception of man: whether in the constitution of the human mind, in the framework of nature, or in the processes of Providential government. The term is used to embrace the whole compass of the Divine disclosures, whether in act or word, whether by immediate contact of the Eternal Spirit with the human soul or by mediating instrumentalities, whether of truth generally or any special token of the Divine will. In this more general application other words are used besides apokalupsis, or revelation: such as photizo, of the light of the Son in human reason which lighteth every man that cometh into the world; fanerón, 1 of the declaration of the Divine glory in the universe, and of the testimony of the Supreme to all men to whom that which may be known of God is manifest,2 referring to His providential guidance of the Gentiles before whom He left not Himself without witness, OUK AMARTURON.3 It is sufficient for our present purpose that all these lower and more unrestricted or improper revelations and methods of revelation are taken up into Revelation proper. The Records of the Faith are the records of all the teachings that at sundry times 4 and in divers manners preceded and prepared for it.

There is, however, a special and limited meaning of the term. But, before considering this more fully, it may be well to note some theological distinctions which lead the way to it.

1 John 1:9; 2 Romans 1:19; 3 Acts 14:17; 4 Hebrews 1:1

1. The word revelation unites the two ideas of a Divine unveiling or apokalupsis, and making known or fanerosis, of the mysteries of religion, or of the soul's relation to God.

We must remember the conventional meaning of these terms in theology. There are secrets gradually unveiled in the worlds of mind and matter, the slow disclosure of which is appointed to be the aim and the reward of human science; but we do not call them mysteries. Nor do we call their discovery revelation, save as they are directly connected with religion and taken up into the economy of the Providential government of the world.

2. This leads to another distinction: Revelation, in this higher theological meaning of the term, is general and special. As GENERAL it is undoubtedly common to the human race as such: the foundation of what may be called natural theology and natural religion.

Although, as we have seen, the highest word is not: used of this universal unveiling of God in the creature, it may be called natural as distinguished from supernatural revelation. This latter is SPECIAL; as being imparted not so much in man; as to man, through the medium both of Divine works and Divine words, as will be hereafter seen.

3. External and internal revelation are to be separated: the former is as it were given objectively and for all; the latter is specially imparted to the organs of revelation, and to those who receive it in faith. They are united in St. Paul's words: by revelation He made known unto me 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 by the Spirit. 1 Here is the special revelation not included in the former general manifestations of God; the disclosure to the organs of inspiration as a body; and the internal unveiling to St. Paul by the Spirit, to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery. But it is obvious that all external revelation must also be internal, though the converse may not be said with the same propriety.

1 Ephesians 3:3-9.

SPECIAL REVELATION.

Revelation, in the stricter, deeper, and fuller sense, is the unfolding of the eternal counsel of God in Christ, for the restoration of man to fellowship with Himself. This is the sum and substance of truth as truth is in Jesus; 1 it is the conclusion of the whole matter of Divine manifestation to man; and, as such, it is perfected in the Christian Scriptures, that is, in the final testimony of Jesus. His testimony is the last word of all objective revelation. In this definition there are three salient points; the one Eternal Purpose in Christ the Revealer, the perfect Scripture, and the identity, or rather coincidence, of the Christian oracles with the Christian Faith.

1 Ephesians 4:21.

1. Revelation proper is consecrated to the mystery hid with Christ in God, the one Secret which it unfolds. This is the common burden of the prophets and of the Apostles and of Christ Himself. It is

the ONE TRUTH of the whole Word of God. The entire range of its disclosures, in all their many forms, is governed by this supreme purpose, and all pay their tribute to this one subject. Christ, Himself the Sum of all revelation, is Himself also the one Revealer or Apocalyptist. He is the Revealer in act and in word. First, and above all, in act He is Himself the personal revelation of God and His whole eternal purpose towards the human race. This profound truth of Christianity is presupposed throughout the New Testament. It may be studied in the combination of several Pauline passages. In the first the great Mystery of Godliness is spoken of as being manifest in the flesh: 1 this refers to the Person of Christ Incarnate, who elsewhere is termed the Mystery of God, which is Christ,2 the one Secret to be revealed in Whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.3 Again, this manifestation is said to be reflected from the mirror of the Gospel, which consummates all Divine disclosures: But we all, with open face receiving as in a glass the glory of the Lord.4 Finally, it is still more clearly explained in a passage which combines the others, as the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ,5 the Countenance of the personal God in His incarnate Son looking upon man and giving him, in the light of that countenance, all that he needs to know for time and eternity. Our Lord Jesus Christ is Himself the substance of all revelation of God, according to His own testimony: He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father.6 Secondly, therefore, He is the Revealer in word. No one knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him: ho Huiós apokalúpsai.7 Christ is THE WORD 8 in His original and eternal estate, Who, however, became incarnate to be the Oracle of God in the temple of humanity. No man hath seen God at any time; the Only begotten God, Who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath made Him known.9 In His incarnate estate He is also THAT PROPHET, 10 Who should absorb into Himself all prophetic functions, whether of announcing or of foretelling the will of God. In virtue of that first name, He has been from the beginning the Revealer: it was His voice that uttered the ancient oracles. In virtue of the latter name superadded to the former, He has summed up, satisfied, and consummated the revelation of all past ages in one perfect revelation for ages to come.

He spake by the prophets; He spake upon earth; and, though gone from us, He yet speaketh. His word means all revelation, and all revelation means His word. The ORACLE and the oracles are one.

11 Timothy 3:16; 2 Colossians 2:2; 3 Colossians 2:3; 4 2 Corinthians 3:18; 5 2 Corinthians 4:6; 6 John 14:9; 7 Matthew 11:27; 8 John 1:1; 9 John 1:18; 10 John 1:21.

2. The Scriptures contain and are this perfect disclosure and finished revelation. Of their Divine origin we need not think as yet; though it is anticipated in the fact that the Savior has given His authenticating testimony to the whole body of them in their integrity. That sanction, first, makes the Old Testament the revelation of Christ. As it testified of Him so He testifies of it. He took it into His hands, and blessed it, and hallowed it forever as His own. As revelation is Christ, and Christ is the subject of the Old Testament, the Old Testament is of necessity the revelation of God. Knowing better than any human critic can know all its internal obscurities and difficulties, He sealed it nevertheless for the reverence of His people. The canon of the ancient oracles, precisely as we hold them now, no more no less, He sanctified and gave to His Church as the early preparatory records of His own Gospel and kingdom. That sanction, secondly, assures us that the New Testament is His own authoritative completion of the Scriptures of revelation.

Leaving the fuller study of this proposition for a further stage, we need only note the general fact that our Lord declared His own purpose to complete an unfinished revelation.

Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill, allá pleeroósai: 1 not only to fulfill the predictions both of law and prophecy, but to fill out their meaning; to set on them the seal of perfection by revealing fully what they revealed only in part. All the lines of Old-Testament revelation were broken off and incomplete: He gathered them up into Himself and His word, so that in Him they might have their vanishing point and yet not vanish. In regard to the Old- Testament oracles the word of St. Paul does not hold good: When that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part will come to an end. 2 And He made full provision for the preservation of His perfected doctrine. All that we need to assure our hearts of this was given in one large promise, which declared that His sayings should be revived in their unbroken unity in His disciples' memory, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you; 3 that what He could not yet speak concerning His Person, His Spirit should reveal, He will guide you into all truth; 4 and that the same Spirit should show them the things to come. The Spirit was no other than Himself by His Agent re-uttering His own words, revealing His own Person and work, and filling up His prophecy of the future. Hence, lastly, our Lord's sanction makes the complete Scriptures the finished revelation, never to be superseded. Nothing can be more plain than that the entire fullness of what the Revealer had to say to the world was to be communicated to the Apostles by the Holy Ghost; and that, not as a further disclosure on the part of the Spirit, but as the consolidation of the Savior's teaching into its perfect unity, and its expansion into its perfect meaning. No future streams of revelation were to rise higher than the fountainhead of truth opened in Himself. Hence we may repeat concerning the Book what has been said concerning the Lord's teaching: the Bible means all revelation and all revelation means the Bible.

1 Matthew 5:17; 2 1 Corinthians 13:10; 3 John 14:26; 4 John 16:13.

3. We are justified, therefore, in holding that the Scriptures of revelation and Christianity, as the Christian Faith, cover the same ground and strictly coincide. As yet, we have nothing to do with the question of inspiration, nor with inquiries into the genuineness and integrity of individual books and individual passages; but only with the general fact that in all sound theology the Bible and Christ are inseparably connected. Not that they are in the nature of things identical: we can suppose the possibility of an Incarnate Revealer present in the world without the mediation of the written Word. Indeed we are bound to assume, as has been already seen, that there is a wider revelation of the WORD in the world than the Scriptures cover. Moreover we may assert that His revelation of Himself is still, and even in connection with the Scriptures, more or less independent of the Word.

But, as the basis of the science of theology, the Bible is Christianity. It has pleased God from the beginning to conduct the development of the great mystery by documents containing the attested facts, the authenticated doctrines, and the sealed predictions of revelation. The process of the Divine Counsel has been bound up with the enlargement of the Volume of the Book. That Book is the foundation of Christianity: the Lord of the Bible and the Bible are indissolubly the Rock on which it is based. We have no other Christian Religion than that which is one with its documents and records; we have no documents and records which do not directly or indirectly pay their tribute to the Christian Religion; and there is no revelation in any department of truth of which the same

may not be said. All revelation is identical with Christianity and summed up in it.

Hence, generally speaking, and as yet regarding the Scriptures only as a whole, we may say that the character of Christianity is the character of the Bible; the claims and credentials of the one are the claims and credentials of the other. This observation will lead us by an easy transition to the counterpart of Revelation: the Christian Faith. THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. The Revelation given by God is the Christian Faith as received by man. The entire body of revealed truth is addressed to the principle of faith, receiving on Divine evidence what becomes matter of certitude and assurance. This is the objective dogmatic Faith delivered to the saints. But this same Faith may also be regarded as having to win the assent of the world, and as presenting its credentials to the reason in order to universal acceptance.

Hence we have two general aspects of our present subject: first the Christian Revelation as accepted by faith, and, secondly, as presenting its evidences to reason. THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION ASACCEPTED. The Christian Revelation in all its compass of truth is addressed to faith primarily, to reason only as subordinated to faith. It is committed to the supreme tenure of that principle which is the evidence and substantiation of spiritual things. This faith extends explicitly to all the facts, doctrines, and promises of the Holy Scripture, and implicitly to all its mysteries whether already revealed, in course of revelation, or reserved for the future. Its supreme object is Christ and the truth as TRUTH is IN JESUS. 1 But it must be remembered that the Christian Faith is effectually such only to those whose belief is quickened by the Holy Ghost into the assurance of personal knowledge and experience.

1 Ephesians 4:21.

It is obvious that this general proposition involves a consideration of the credentials of Christianity; but we have now to do with Revelation only as addressed to faith. As containing the Christian system of truth, and recorded in the Bible, it appeals to a universal principle of human nature, the faculty of believing This primary faculty is profoundly seated in our constitution: it works as the acceptance of truth on sufficient evidence, whether of consciousness, or intuition, or testimony. It is at the root of all knowledge generally, especially of all knowledge of spiritual things. Now it is to this principle pre-eminently that Revelation appeals: to faith alone as it is a revelation of spiritual principles and truth: to faith conjoined with reason as it is a Divine record of facts through which these principles are taught. These two points have now to be briefly discussed.

I. Faith must here in all things have the pre-eminence.

1. The grand revelations of the Word of God are all committed to that highest and noblest faculty which the Scripture calls the evidence of things not seen. 1 The existence of a Supreme First Cause, the creation of the world framed by the Word of God, 2 the nature of sin and the glory of redemption, the Person of the Incarnate and His atonement, the union of the Holy Spirit with the spirit of man, the processes and issues, in time and eternity, of the redeeming economy, in short all that belongs to the supernatural world, must be believed or they are not the heritage of the soul. There is no faculty competent to deal with them, to receive them, to appropriate them, but faith. Reason of itself is the soul’s judgment according to sense: if it is regarded as occupied with the mysteries of the spirit and the spiritual world it is no longer reason but faith under the name of reason.

Faith is to the other world what the senses are to the world that now is; the eye, the ear, the taste, and the touch that perceives what the physical senses cannot perceive. All is thus summed up: The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned. 3 1 Hebrews 11:1; 2 Hebrews 11:3-4; 3 1 Corinthians 2:14

2. Hence it is that, inasmuch as the principle of faith belongs as certainly to human nature as reason does, the evidences of the; supernatural world are addressed to a faculty which they ought to awaken, even as light ought to awaken the faculty of seeing. If the great truths of Revelation excite no response it is because a deadly evil vitiates the faith which does not vitiate the natural senses. It is necessary to dwell upon this, because reason, thus set aside, will ask why it is that Revelation addressed to a universal faculty in man does not meet with instantaneous and universal acceptance.

3. There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding.1 There is a Spirit Who demonstrates truth to the mind, affections, and will of the personal man; but only to him who is sincere and cometh to the light. 2 The credentials of Divine truth are self-evidencing: they are like the light of the sun in the natural world. This preliminary postulate is of the utmost importance, and may be established from the Scripture itself without any irrational begging of the question. First, let our Lord Himself be heard. The testimony concerning Him is, that He is the true Light, which enlighteneth every man, coming into the world. 3 His testimony to Himself, borne, moreover, to one who was not His disciple, is: Every one that is of the truth heareth My voice, 4 where of the truth points to the mystery of man's free posture of mind as disposed or otherwise to be guided aright. This final declaration of Him Who knew what was inMan 1:5 expresses the spirit of His entire teaching concerning the selfmanifestation of His truth to every man's conscience who wills to do His will. 6 Secondly, the light of the body of revelation is the Holy Ghost. The Savior does not appeal to reason, apart from the mediation of the sole and supreme Convincer. That Spirit also knoweth what is in man, and brings His own Divine demonstration to every mind that does not refuse to consider what He says. He so adapts His arguments to the present fallen moral nature of men that their rejection can spring only from the perverseness of those whose spiritual eye of faith is darkened. As Christ is the Truth incarnate, the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of the Truth. 7 He is the great Apologist of Revelation to the world. And St. Paul says, concerning His argument, that it is nothing less than demonstration: en apodeíxei pneúmatos, 8 Hence, thirdly, descending to man, we may appeal to the testimonies of Scripture as to the sin and self-conviction of unbelief. The tenor of those testimonies may be summed up in the same Apostle's last word, concerning the heretic, the Hairetikón ánthroopon: he is autokatákritos, condemned of himself. 9 Those who resist the truth are men of corrupt minds, and this has its evidence in their being reprobate concerning the faith. 10 On the other hand, he tells us that there is a manifestation of the truth to every man's conscience in the sight of God; 11 and that, in every case in which it is hid, the cause is to be found in a blindness superadded by the god of this world. The same God who in the natural sphere commanded the light to shine out of darkness 12 in the beginning, commandeth still the light of His knowledge to shine in the face of Jesus Christ. No command of God can be disobeyed. There was light follows Let there be light 13 in the moral world also; but the light, like its Author, may be rejected of men: the darkness comprehendeth it not.14

1 Job 32:8; 2 John 3:21; 3 John 1:9; 4 John 18:37; 5 John 2:25; 6 John 7:17; 7 John 16:13; 8 1 Corinthians 2:4; 9 Titus 3:11; 10 2 Timothy 3:8; 11 2 Corinthians 4:2-4; 12 2 Corinthians 4:6; 13 Genesis 1:3; 14 John 1:5.

4. To those who receive the light, in the sense of not refusing it, revelation is one whole, and all its glorious system of truth is received and surely believed. To them it is both objectively and subjectively THE FAITH; and, inasmuch as Christianity has brought it in all its fullness into the world, it is to them THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. This phrase has therefore a large meaning. It signifies that it is not their Philosophy simply, the glory of their reason, the Tradition they have derived from their fathers, but the rich inheritance which the Holy Spirit has given to that one supreme faculty of their souls, the faith which is the evidence of things not seen. 1 It is a body of truth which, as reason did not give it, so reason cannot take it away. It is a region in which they walk by faith, which their faith habitually visits, in which their faith lives, and moves, and has its being.

1 Hebrews 11:1.

II. But some of these remarks have already suggested that faith is strictly allied with reason in the acceptance of Christianity as a system of truth. The Spirit Who awakens faith regenerates the reason so that it humbles itself to receive mysteries which it cannot understand; the evidences on which faith rests are such as; the reason is called on to approve, here the judgment of the mind having its full honor; and in the acceptance of the whole economy of the Scriptures of Revelation faith and sound reason; are blended into a perfect unity.

1. The Christian Faith presents to the faculty by which the infinite and the eternal are perceived a system of truth which human reason cannot fathom or understand, against which it naturally rebels. But the same Spirit Who opens the eye of faith gives reason its perfect soundness, so that it consents to accept what it cannot itself verify. Here of course we regard Revelation as one organic whole, which has for its unifying principle one overwhelming truth, the union of God and man in Christ. Around this centre revolve other equally incomprehensible doctrines; and beyond these in a wider orbit many which are not in the same sense beyond the human faculties. And speaking of the one vast Revelation we may say that it is committed to faith and submissively wondered at by reason. Faith is elevated to receive it and reason humbled to submit to it.

2. But this faith is not arbitrary or despotic. It gives its rights to reason in all things over which reasoning presides. It presents the evidences for the being of God, for the Incarnation of the Son, for the mystery of the Atonement; and reason must either admit the evidence as in the case of the Divine existence, or confess that it has nothing to plead against it, as in the case of the Incarnation. Like sin before the presence of Divine justice reason shuts her mouth and is silent. But, descending into the province of the general external evidences of Revelation the matter changes its character. Either it must be said that here reason and faith are one under different names, or faith must be regarded as no longer the faculty of perceiving the infinite but as the principle of believing on evidence. In either view faith and reason are here inseparable. Faith accepts and relies on what there is every reasonable ground for believing. Our great term, THE CHRISTIAN FAITH, then becomes the body of external revelation which is surely believed in by all Christians because they are assured of the strength of its evidences. But this leads us at once to the Credentials of Revelation. THE CREDENTIALS OF THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION.

Revelation, which is one with the Christian Faith, which is one with its documents and records, presents its sufficient Credentials to the reason and heart and will of man as one great body of irresistible evidence. First, it comes to mankind as a response to the universal desire and expectation of communication from above: to the craving of the human heart for communion with God. Secondly, Revelation exhibits, in its own structure, the Divine attributes as stamped upon every part of its system in the form of miracle, prophecy, and inspiration. Thirdly, it furnishes, in the Person of Christ the Revealer, its heavenly guarantee of its own truth. Fourthly, in its perfect consummation as Christianity, it appeals to the character of its influence in human history: positively in its victory over the world's evil, and negatively in its victory over all opposition. Lastly, it relies, as a Divine revelation might be expected to rely, on the demonstration of the Holy Spirit. All its credentials may without much difficulty be classed under these several heads: so far that is as they are a general apology and vindication of the Christian Faith contained in itself. The Revelation of Christ in the Scriptures enforces its own claims, and theology must pay supreme deference to those internal credentials. These become Evidences when they are arranged in their order. What the Law was to the earlier Gospel, Evidences are to Credentials: added because of human weakness. They have their use, as it respects both the believer and the unbeliever; to the former for confirmation, to the latter for conviction.

1. The believer is taught by them how to give a reason of the; hope that is in him: to be ready or prepared, prós apologían, 1 for Apology. St. Luke, the Evangelist of the Evidences, sets this: clearly before us: he so arranges the testimonies of the Faith that; Theophilus, already instructed in the verities most surely believed, might know the certainty of those things: epignoós, 2 referring to an accurate and systematic knowledge.

Both for the confirmation of his own faith, and for the conviction of the gainsayer, every Christian, especially every Christian minister, should have the form of sound defense at hand to guard the form of sound words the Hupotúpoosin,3 or systematic arrangement, is equally necessary for each.

1 1 Peter 3:15; 2 Luke 1:4; 3 2 Timothy 1:13.

2. As to the unbeliever, the Credentials must be so arranged as to form a complete body of evidence for his possible conviction: without either undervaluing or over-estimating their importance. They must not be despised by a transcendental reliance on the selfevidencing light. Christianity, like its Founder, has a mission to seek that it may save. Its history, both within and without the Bible, is a record of calm reasonings with the mind, even of those who turn away. Evidences or signs are for those who believe not. There may be cases in which the arguments used concerning Revelation may induce the skeptic to listen to the voice of Revelation itself. But, on the other hand, too much must not be expected from them, as they are external evidences apart from the interior demonstration of the truth. Our Lord and His Apostles have left us no instance of argument with those who held not some measure of faith to which their reasonings might appeal. As the Book of Revelation does not reason with Atheism, neither does Christianity lay any stress on reasoning with Infidelity and disbelief.

3. Various terms have been here introduced: such as unbeliever, disbeliever, doubter, and skeptic. These bear their shades of meaning, which it is important to remember and discriminate in all discussions on this subject. It is well known that in the New Testament there is everywhere a clear

and broad distinction between two classes: believers and unbelievers. But it is not Implied that the state of unbelief is that in which nothing is believed: on the contrary, UNBELIEF is DISBELIEF and disbelief is the belief of the opposite of that which faith holds. Not that no room is left for a neutral state, that in which men muse in their hearts and remain suspended in doubt. DOUBT hesitates between two contradictory conclusions. It may have some degree of belief, checked by a consciousness of ignorance: in this case it is provisional, waiting for more light, and the New Testament gives several instances of this as worthy to be reasoned with. It may be definitive, and is then SCEPTICISM, or the surrender of the mind to a conviction of the impossibility of certainty, with a tranquil complacency in such a state. But as skepticism believes that truth cannot be found, it is itself faith in necessary ignorance, unbelief of that about which it doubts, and therefore really disbelief. Hence the bad sense which is generally attached to the word in Christian Evidences.

4. Let it be further observed that these credentials have no reference to those branches of evidences that concern the volume externally viewed: they come from the heart of Revelation as it is one great communication in Christ; and the question of the authenticity and authority of the several parts of the Holy Scriptures must be postponed. It must be remembered also that the Apologetics of the Christian Faith accompany the several doctrines; every article of the creed requires its own defense; and therefore the evidences of Christianity must needs be distributed over the whole course of our dogmatic system.

Again, they allow opportunity for the fair consideration of everything that can be said for or against Christianity as such, without descending, however, to innumerable subordinate questions, which have no importance in themselves. Once more, the exhibition of these credentials in all their grandeur will simplify the later evidences as to the several doctrines of the Bible, and at the same time lend those evidences their own force. Finally, this arrangement enables us to do justice to the cumulative character of the argument: it is not merely an accumulation of all that may be said on the subject, but such an orderly presentation as will make every argument, whether more or less important, both give and receive strength through its connection with the rest. THE RESPONSE TO THE RELIGIOUS EXPECTATION OF MANKIND.

Christianity, or the perfect Divine Revelation, presents itself as the answer to a universal demand. It explains while it appeals to the innate craving of the human mind to know God, or its sentiment of religion, and accounts for the general expectation of the Race, as expressed in its traditional Religions: appealing to them by what they contain of truth, and by what they contain of falsehood. It comes with these credentials; and, moreover, pleads as being the perfect utterance of a Revelation which has been among men from the beginning, and, therefore, as the response to an expectation kept alive in the world by its own earlier teachings. Under this first department of credentials must be included all those preliminary considerations which are sometimes reckoned as Presumptive Evidences. In systems of Apologetics, or Evidences, presumptive arguments are commonly arranged in a threefold gradation. First, it is shown that a Divine revelation is POSSIBLE, whether as it respects the Giver of it or the recipient. Secondly, the deficiencies of reason within and the failures of human religion without are urged to establish that such a revelation is NECESSARY. Then, thirdly the conclusion follows that it is PROBABLE: the probability, when the Divine goodness and man’s desire are taken into the account, reaching the point which only falls short of moral certainty. Now this chain of propositions may be established: the argument breaks down nowhere. But, for the reasons already given, it seems better to attain

the same object by first of all examining the Revelation itself.

Instead of arguing over the first proposition, the affirmation of which is contradicted by a certain school of philosophy, we must assume it to be true by appealing to the consciousness of all men, the doubters included. To conduct this argument without taking some revelation for granted is a thing impossible. And it is certain that it is more after the manner of the Bible to set out with the credentials of Revelation itself than to array a number of internal and presumptive evidences in its-absence. THE DESIRE OF THEHUMANMIND.

Divine revelation appeals to a preparation in the human spirit which it explains and accounts for: first, the instinctive and indestructible sense of dependence on a First Cause; secondly, the consciousness of responsibility to a Supreme Authority; and, thirdly, the union of these in the deep desire to know and have fellowship with the Source and End of life. This three-one fact in human nature revelation challenges; and here is its first credential. The instinct in man and the response from God meet. From the first word of the Scriptures to the last the Voice of the Creator speaks to the still small voice of His creature: the Voice of the All-sufficient answering the cry of dependence, of the Merciful Judge dealing with guilt, and of the Eternal and Invisible conversing as Man with humanity. In the Bible, as completed by Christianity, there is not a possible question of human nature to which a response is not given. The positive strength of this plea will be considered when we come to establish the existence of God. Meanwhile, it may be necessary here to obviate two opposite objections which may be urged against this most mighty presumptive argument.

1. Atheistic philosophy of every order is content to assert that the sentiment in human nature is one of the fruits of its own imagination, begotten of fear or hope; and that it has invented a revelation to satisfy the demands of its own delusion: the imaginary revelation from heaven being, like heaven itself, its most consummate delusion. With such theories of the soul it is vain to argue: at least, they do not enter into the present discussion. Save, indeed, so far as they sometimes undertake to deny that what we may term this instinct is really universal in the constitution of man. This is simply an appeal to experience and induction. No race of humanity has ever been found which does not contradict this denial. Among the very lowest tribes there are traces of a certain sense of dependence on another world: the degraded feeling which looks with awe at some fetish symbol of the unknown is the same tribute at the one pole as the philosophical speculation of Agnosticism is at the opposite pole, to a sense in man of the Infinite. The finite instinct for the Infinite, which is faith, undergoes in them the same degradation which; all their other mental and spiritual faculties have undergone: no more, no less. But of this more will be said hereafter.

2. Deism has another and very different kind of counterargument. It sometimes insists that these instinctive preparations for the voice of God are themselves the revelation of the Supreme, and that there can be no other: that is to say, a transcendental Deism refuses to allow that there can be any other authenticated revelation of the Infinite to the finite than that which is direct in the consciousness of those who receive it. But it forgets that the; very highest religious sentiment in man is only a desire unsatisfied; and that, as every strong and universal instinct has its answer from without, so also must this the strongest and most universal of all. But it may be denied that there is any longing of the human mind for an external revelation. Many who admit that the irrepressible yearning of the human soul towards the Infinite is an. argument for the expectation of a secret revelation of God in the depths of the yearning spirit nevertheless refuse to admit the

force of this appeal in favor of a revelation coming from above with all the external appendages that belong to the Christian Faith. It is sufficient to reply that this style of argument ignores the fact that the relation of man to God is such as to demand an external communication as well as an internal. If he were, as he should be, at peace with the Object he seeks, the communion with his Maker might be conducted altogether within. Yet even then not altogether within; for the whole universe around him would be full of symbols, the visible revelation of his Creator. But he is, by the very supposition, estranged from God. The original conditions have ceased to exist: and no argument can be based upon them. The unutterable longing to which Christianity responds is that of a guilty spirit; not only dependent on the Supreme, but trembling before Him. Man looks up to heaven—as his Greek name, anthroopínee, testifies; but he looks up to an outward Judge and not within to an interior God; and expects and hopes that the Supreme will appear to him and speak to him by some being, or voice, or token. And this is the germ of all revelation.

Moreover, it is undeniable that in every age and in every region men have longed for and believed in an external expression of the Divine mind. In fact, Christianity is but one of many responses to man's groaning unutterable towards God. But this leads to a further stage in our credentials, to which what has been said is only introductory.

CORRECTION OF THE RELIGIONS OF MANKIND. As Divine revelation responds to the spirit in man, so it explains and responds to the great Anticipation of the Human Race, as testified by its universal Religions. This also is a most mighty credential, which may be regarded under several aspects.

1. The Christian Religion explains the religiousness of mankind, and pays respect to the forms in which this has been expressed. St. Paul, the amplest expositor of Natural Theology, preaches in the Acts, and teaches in the Epistle to the Romans, that the whole world has always been under a Divine education: drawn by God's works of creation to contemplate His power, and by the benefits of His providence to consider His goodness, in order that it might thus be prepared for a third revelation which should display both His power and His goodness in redemption. The Apostle, as the leading representative of this argument, professes only to DECLARE or preach, —katangélloo humín—the UNKNOWN GOD 1 Whom all the world had been ever consciously or unconsciously seeking: that world which is, as Tertullian said of the human spirit, naturaliter Christianus. He makes God Himself, in a certain sense, the universal Teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity, didáskalos ethnoón, 2 and heathenism, like the law, a schoolmaster unto Christ. In other words, this representative of Christianity traces all forms of religious faith and practice among the nations to a yearning for revelation from heaven. And he in fact gives us the argument we now use: the strong presumption from the Consensus Gentium, the consent of all the world, in favor of a communication from God to mankind. For, Christianity, which is revelation made perfect, or rather the only true revelation, appeals to the anticipation it explains. Tracing to their ultimate cause both the truth and the error, it makes both subservient to its own credentials. It must be remembered that the New Testament is in this the successor and continuator of the Old. The whole Bible appeals from beginning to end, that is since the time that external religion began, to; the common, tribal or national, instinct of the peoples of the earth. This argument we shall hereafter use in demonstration of the existence of a Divine Source of all things: namely, the very fact that the Bible regards it as already a secret thought, ready to be revealed, in the hearts of all men. Our present argument supposes that the being of God is admitted. And its strength is this, that that God has in

every age been training the nations for a full disclosure of Himself. As it is written: He correcteth the Gentiles; 3 or places them under discipline.

1 Acts 17:23; 2 1 Timothy 2:7; 3 Psalms 94:10.

2. All this has taken for granted that the forms of religion always existing in heathenism have possessed certain elements of truth. Otherwise they would be worthless as evidence of a universal aspiration towards communion with heaven. Whatever strong assertions we may find in the Old and New Testaments of the doctrinal errors and moral abominations of heathenism, we discern everywhere an acknowledgment of something good lying at their root, of which they are only the perversions. Much truth is tacitly recognized in the sacred traditions of mankind, however waning and ready to perish: that is to say, much truth dispersed among them and variously represented, though no one system may be said to exhibit even the perversions of all truths. Perhaps almost all the great tribal or national expressions of the feeling after the Infinite have more or less paid their tribute to the unity and supremacy of the One Unknown God, with a dim perception of a plurality in that unity; to the existence of intelligences higher than man, as it were between God and man, this notion being disguised in a thousand ways, from Polytheism down to the personification of all the forces of nature; to the degradation of man himself through a fall, and the universality of sin as personal guilt and liability to punishment; to a mysterious Deliverer desired of the nations; to the sense of the necessity and acceptableness of worship by sacrifice ; in the ethical domain to the rights of the Bight and the goodness of the Good; to the inextinguishable hope of immortality, more distorted perhaps than almost any other truth. Now it is a credential of the Christian revelation that it acknowledges all this; or rather that all this is true. Professing to be the supreme, the only direct, communication from God to man, it points to a universal consent among the nations that some such revelation was expected and was needed.

3. But this leads to the further argument, that Christianity explains and corrects these errors while it confirms the truth underlying them all. It comes as the correction of every delusion into which it declares the Eternal had permitted the world to fall as the consequence of its resistance of His Spirit. It teaches the true doctrine concerning God.

Sweeping away the pantheism, the polytheism, the atheism of the nations: it amends the doctrine of sin, by connecting it with redemption; it substitutes the true Divine-human Sacrifice, its expiation cleansing the heathen temple, its gift of the Spirit supplying the need of the heathen philosophical schools; it reforms the whole economy of worship, by revealing a Mediator; it supplies the defects and reproves the corruptions of the world’s ethical systems; and it brightens and simplifies its doctrine of the future state.

4. Such are the credentials of the Christian revelation: such are its claims to be heard. No further plea is at present urged than this. No other system, among the many candidates for acceptance, has ever made such pretensions as these. No ancient creed or religion, however missionary in its spirit, ever professed to come from God with the explanation and sure guidance of the world’s spiritual desires. Christianity alone explains heathenism, with a solution at once gentle and stern. And it alone brings in the time of a universal reformation. This is, however, laid down only as its credential: as such it has all the force, although no more than the force, of a preliminary demand for profound respect and solemn attention to its appeals.

5. Objections to this credential, as such, and limited strictly to the present stage of the argument, may be noticed at once and disarmed in a few sentences. It will be said by the Atheist, or the Antitheist, that Christianity, in common with every other form of the religious sentiment among men, is no more than an invention of the human mind—or that subtle action of matter which is called the mind—and the most beautiful, though not always the most beautiful, evolution in man of those strange phenomena which in the lower orders of creation make man himself their object. All the history of religion, in every part of the world, and among all the tribes of mankind, is only the record of the evolution of something in man that has no name, no object, and apparently no meaning.

We are not at present concerned with the Atheist; and may postpone further reference to this subject. Meanwhile, there is another form of the objection which cannot be thus summarily dismissed.

(1.) It appears to many students of what may be called Comparative Theology that the existence of so many other religions, containing so many noble and uncontested truths, is a bar to the acceptance of Christianity as the one definitive revelation of God. They deny the distinction between natural religion and super-natural, between natural theology and revealed. They assert that all the faiths or mythologies of mankind are natural or supernatural alike, according as these words are understood. All are supernatural, in the sense that the Creator has lodged in the spirit of man a faculty for the Infinite, which has developed in a few great historical religions; just as the Creator gave man a, supernatural endowment of language, which has been developed into a few great families of speech.

All are natural, in the sense that all have their natural pedigree, and may be traced through the various nationalities as, equally with language and perhaps more than language, the foundation of race distinctions. Hence, the Science of Religion distinguishes in various ways the religions of mankind. There are the religions which should be traced to individual founders: such as Moses, Zoroaster, Buddha, Confucius, Lao-tse, Christ, and Mohammed. And there are those which are national, and have never been connected with human names: the religions of the ancient Brahmans, the Greeks, Romans, Teutons, Slavs, and Celts. Again, we have the Faiths which have Sacred Books and those which are without them: of the former eight being reckoned, Brahmanism and Buddhism among the Hindus; Zornastrianisrn among the Persians; among the Hebrews, Mosaism and Christianity; among the Arabs, Mohammedanism; among the Chinese, Confucianism and the religion of Lao-tse. These distinctions rise at last into the division of two or three great families. First, the Aryan, subdivided into the Brahmanism of the Yeda, Buddhism which sprang from it and revolted against it, and Zoroastrianism, which departed from the ancient Yedic faith. Secondly, the Semitic, with its Old and New Testament religions, the latter transferred, however, into Aryan soil: and Mohammedanism. These have played the most distinguished part in the history of the world hitherto; but a third must be added, the Turanian, to which the branches of Chinese religion belong. The argument deduced from the study of Comparative Theology is simply this: that there is not one religion which is of Divine right, and must needs be separated from all the rest. In plain words, whatever other distinctions there are— between Monotheistic and Polytheistic, Documentary and Traditional, Cultivated and Fetish—the distinction between true and false religions is not to be allowed. There is no final, definitive, supreme religion for mankind, any more than there is one universal language for mankind. This science, which is comparatively new,

makes a fair show of zeal for all religions; and, indeed, most triumphantly vindicates the truth, depth, and universality of the Godward tendency in our nature. But this is at the expense of Christianity, however seemingly on its side. In fact, it takes away all the strength of the credential now under consideration, so far as it concerns Christianity, while leaving it in its full force so far as it concerns revelation generally, or the religion of nature. What then is to be said in defense of our argument?

(2.) First, and foremost, the Science of Religion pays too much honor to the Faiths of the World when it brings Christianity into conjunction or comparison with them. After allowing all that the catholic Apostle asserts as to the religiousness of mankind—our argument has done justice to that—we must not forget his dark testimony against the outward forms of that religiousness. The world by wisdom knew not God. 1 Comparative Theology collects a number of sublime sayings about God to which Hindu devotion gave birth; but it is undeniable that the system of Brahmanism was at almost all points a gigantic parody on the religion of supernatural revelation. Attempt after attempt from age to age was made to reform it; but its greatest reformation, that of Buddhism, —now one of the most extensively held faiths in the world—was and is in reality a religion without a God: the vastest waste of Atheism that has ever been known. Christianity is not one of the religions of the world: responding, like others, to the common instinct, only in bolder and sublimer terms. Once more, Christianity is not what the Science of Religions makes it: an offshoot from Mosaism, and an improvement on it, as Buddhism rose out of the old Vedic faith and put away its old gods. It is the one only religion that the world has ever received directly from heaven. In its present form, and with its present name, it originated in the midst of Judaism, at a certain epoch, and struggled for and won its ascendancy much after the manner of other religions. But Christianity as Divine Revelation is only the consummate form of a truth, or a system of truths, that has been in the world from the beginning of human history. But this will introduce another very important aspect of our credentials.

1 1 Corinthians 1:21.

CHRISTIANITY THEPERFECTINGOF FORMER REVELATIONS.

It is a continuation of the same argument to say that Christianity is itself an explanation of the preparatory disclosures of revealed truth, and the consummation of them all.

1. This is, in fact, the crowning presumptive argument in its favor, that it is the end and completion of a revelation that has been going on from the beginning. It is not a religion that literally began in Judaea with the advent of Jesus. It does not profess to be the first supernatural communication to mankind: it is not the opening of the heavens for the first time. It finishes a testimony that began with the fall of man: in the best sense, it is therefore as old as the Creation. This last sentence has been made the watchword of English Infidelity: as if its being coeval with the human race were a disproof of its Divine original. But this is in fact its glory. It is the last accent of a Voice which spoke first at the gate of Paradise. That voice was the Primitive Revelation from the perversions of which all the innumerable forms of mythology arose. But that Voice awakened the desire of the human race to which all revelation has been a response, and has constantly deepened that desire whilst it responded to it. But only in a peculiar line, and within a limited area. On either side of that line, and beyond that area, men groped after the lost, Creator and the forfeited Paradise in their own way: being dealt with both in justice and in mercy. The mercy of the Supreme has in every age guided

the instincts of all the sincere. St. Peter is as catholic as St. Paul on this subject. Discerning in Cornelius the best religion of the Gentiles, he said: I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is acceptable to Him. 1 But justice abandoned the races as such to the consequences of their own perverseness: because that, when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. 2 Thus the two Apostles agree: as to individuals the sincere have been guided towards an unknown Savior; as to the races the just Providence of God dealt with them according to their inventions. Meanwhile, there has been in every age a clear, distinct, though not voluminous announcement of the will of God, delivered to a chosen and faithful people. And the peculiarity of these preliminary revelations has been this, that every word has at once satisfied human aspiration and kindled it to higher desire. Christianity is the final answer to a continuous expectation kept up from age to age. It is the response to what may be called a third form of the great anticipation: besides the instinct in every human spirit, and in the human race as such, man has had, though all men have not had, an express testimony of the Mind of the Supreme, leading human hope onward to the perfect revelation of Christ. Christianity comes as the perfecting of its earlier Self: the final and sufficient response to the expectation it had kept up from the beginning. This is its supreme preparatory credential.

It is the last of many words, and leaves nothing more to be desired in the present estate of mankind.

1 Acts 10:34-35; 2 Romans 1:21.

2. The force of this credential will be felt only by those who already accept, or are disposed to accept, the revelation of Jesus. The more it is pondered the more satisfactory will it seem to all who take a large view of the dealings of Providence with man. There are, of course, unsearchable mysteries in the subject: mysteries so perplexing that they have driven some speculatists to the renunciation of a God. To those who do believe in God the gradual education of a world free and responsible is a thought to be accepted and reposed in. It is more tolerable at least than other thoughts which would displace it. It is more in harmony with every high conception of the Supreme to suppose that He has in every age been communicating His will with more and more clearness to mankind, having always in view a final and full disclosure, than to suppose that He planted a religious germ in man’s heart which has been always developing with infinite variety in every variety of soils, no provision whatever being made for the survival of the best, without indeed allowing that there is or that there can be any best.

(1.) But the objection may be urged that it is below the dignity of a Divine revelation to keep the world so long in suspense. In answer to this we can only refer to the analogy of all the other dealings of God which come within our cognizance. The earth as man’s abode, the history of all the creatures that it inherit, especially the progress of everything pertaining to its chief inhabitant, has been under a law of secular and slow evolution.

Supposing the entire economy of things to be under the government of one Supreme Mind—that is to say, supposing the God of revelation to be the Author of nature—there can be, or there ought to be, no difficulties in the way of considering at least the claims of a revelation which professes to describe the methods of a gradual education of the human race. To the Theistic advocates of development this ought to be a strong recommendation of the Holy Scriptures, and of their final

solution of all mysteries in Christianity. With its Materialistic or Positivist advocates of course we have nothing to do: there are no credentials which appeal to them. They must give up their delusion of Nescience or unintelligent and meaningless Law, and first be reconciled to a Personal Author of all things, before the Christian Revelation even looks their way. But those who admit that the laying of the material foundations of the superstructure of intelligent life required incalculable ages ought not to shrink from the preliminary announcement that God has at sundry times and in divers manners spoken to the human race, and finally consummated all His words in His Son.

(2.) If, once more, it be pointed out—as it constantly is—that what professes to be the last revelation is after all only a partial response to the deep questions of mankind, this may be granted as a fact, but it is robbed of its force as an argument by the suggestion that even Christianity is only part of a scheme, understood only by the Infinite Mind, the first elements of which alone are brought within the range of our faculties. It will be shown hereafter that there is not a solitary question of the human-spirit, on the answer to which its present peace and its probation for eternal happiness depend, which the Holy Oracles do not satisfy. More than that we have no right to expect. Had the revelation of Jesus professed to leave no mystery unexplained, that would have been a stronger plea against its Divinity than infidelity has ever yet been able to find.

SUMMARY. The cumulative strength of these pleas, the line of which only has been indicated, is or should be irresistible. They have immense force as a moral demonstration of the claims of Christianity to be heard and weighed with the most profound solemnity. Not to listen to Christ is to be self-condemned. His words are the only response to the universal anticipation of the human; race: as existing in the very constitution of the mind, as testified; by the consent of nations, and as kept alive from the beginning by supernatural and gradual disclosures of the Divine will. Either I God has thus finally spoken, or there is no God, and man is the incomprehensible creation of chance and the sport of the chance that created him. THE EXHIBITION OF GOD AND OF HISATTRIBUTESIN REVELATION.

Another class of the credentials of revelation is found in its exhibition of the Divine attributes, displayed in the tokens of the presence of God generally, and particularly in the supernatural order of miracles, prophecy, and inspiration as including both, which everywhere reigns. These are not so much notes and qualities of revelation as the fabric of the revelation itself; and have always been, whether separately or combined, the strong enforcement of, its claims upon attention and acceptance.

REVELATIONSUPERNATURAL.

God is a Personal Presence in the whole economy of revealed truth. But He is not present in the same sense as that in which He is immanent in the world: revelation is, has ever been and must ever be, a supernatural order, blending with the natural And moving on harmoniously with it in general, whilst exhibiting most essential differences. But here it is necessary to define terms, or rather to remind ourselves of their conventional relations.

1. There is a sense in which the natural order of things—that is, the constitution of nature as governed by certain fixed physical and metaphysical laws—must always be touched if not pervaded by the supernatural, that is, by what is not matter of our constant experience. The invisible world, and all interventions from the spiritual world, are supernatural. Hence it follows that

the introduction of man into this system of things was a supernatural intervention; and all revelations of the unseen in the constitution of his nature are supernatural; and all evidences of the presence and glory of God in the universe as seen by man are supernatural.

2. This then being granted, there is a sense also in which the great economy to which the Bible bears witness is in a preeminent sense supernatural. From beginning to end—that is, from the first intimation of a coming Redeemer to His final manifestation with final and eternal truth upon His lips—all has been beyond and above the nature of man's ordinary experience. All has been one vast and never-ceasing demonstration of God moving among men and supernaturally operating in human affairs. His wonderful works pervade the whole, though only on occasions bursting into what we call Miracle. They have displayed His presence in His own immediate acts, or in acts above nature performed by the instrumentality of His creatures. They have displayed His one design in the communication of knowledge concerning it to His ministers in Prophecy. They have displayed His wisdom in the preservation, through men raised up to be objects of Inspiration, of the continuous record of His revealed economy of salvation. Thus the laws of the supernatural operation have been threefold. MIRACLE is the intervention of the Supreme Power in the established course of nature. The Creator put all things under the control of general law, but it is manifest that He is excepted who did subject all things 1 to it. His personal authority is not a violation of law, nor a suspension of it, but the introduction of a new and sufficient cause of any effect He would produce. PROPHECY is the intervention of the supreme knowledge, imparted to man independently of the ordinary laws of knowing: whether for the purpose of uttering new truth, or of foretelling what, to all but God, is contingent in the future. INSPIRATION is that supernatural intervention of the Divines wisdom by which the miracle of prophecy is made permanent in the organic unity of Scripture. Now these are all of the essence of revelation: they combine in every part of it. The Scriptures, or Revelation, or the Christian faith—these three are one—have exhibited one vast and permanent miracle, one great prophecy ever in coarse of fulfillment, and one great result of inspiration.

1 1 Corinthians 15:27.

3. These three may be regarded as one great continuous Miracle, and one great body of credentials commending to us the Scriptures of revelation. But these credentials for faith must have their own evidences for reason. As they belong to the supernatural order they must be received by faith. They imply, indeed they assert, the being of God, and His intervention for objects, and in a manner, before which reason sinks confounded. But as facts recorded and humanly attested, they must be received on evidence which is trustworthy and amenable to the tests of trustworthiness. These two must combine; just as in all things pertaining to religion, faith and reason must unite: being reconciled when they differ, and blended into the harmony of certitude. In examining these several evidences of God in revelation each must be viewed as distinct. But, in considering them as credentials of one great scheme professedly the revelation of a God Whose existence is admitted, we are not under the necessity of examining at length the question which touches their abstract possibility in a philosophical point of view. We regard them as the internal demonstrations of Scripture, and have only to ask what their force and meaning are as credentials, and to prove that no condition of such credentials is wanting. THE CREDENTIAL OFMIRACLES.

There are many and distinct terms used in Scripture to signify what we call miracles.

They are called generally the ergon, or works of God; sometimes these works are referred to as acts of the Divine power that effects them, and they are then MIRACLES OR dunamesi; sometimes the purpose for which they are wrought is made emphatic in their designation, and they are SIGNS or shmeia. A third term, terata, is occasionally connected with these; but, as it merely refers to the immediate effect produced on the minds of beholders, it has no theological importance. All that requires to be said as to the credentials of Miracle may be referred to these two words respectively.

WONDERFUL WORKS OF GOD The former, the highest expression of which is in the Pentecostal word, The wonderful works of God, 1 pervades the whole Scripture, which clearly distinguishes between the ordinary operations of Providence and these extraordinary tokens of the Divine presence.

It makes miracle the special intervention of omnipotence: in this sense also there is no power but of God. Revelation shows us the Maker of the laws of the universe, which we understand only as the invariable sequence of cause and effect, introducing when He pleases a new cause: not violating His own laws, or suppressing, or arresting them; not using the operation of more extensive laws than those known to exist, but simply bringing in new causes of new effects when He sees fit. Faith recognizes the FINGER OF GOD; 2 , 3 and reason, admitting the existence of a Supreme Cause, assents to this. Its definition of Miracle is an act of the immediate power of God intervening in the connection of natural causes and effects. It does not argue with those who deny to the God of nature this power and freedom to use it. The preliminary objection against the possibility of miracle, and the value of any amount of evidence that might seek to establish its credibility, can never be met by any other argument than this first term. It is well that the Apologist of revelation should take a high stand here. If there is a Personal God there can be no a priori reason why He should not interfere with His own laws. No continuity and unbroken order of sequence in cause and effect can be made an argument against the possibility of its being disturbed. The last word of philosophy on the subject is that our faith in the stability of nature is a primary law of human thought, as certainly bound up in our mental constitution as our consciousness of personal identity. Now we have an equally firm faith operating as a primary law of thought that an omnipotent Being can, if He will, put forth His Finger and regulate in a new way laws the general order of which He does not violate. On this conviction rests all the evidence that miracles need as they are manifestations of a Divine presence.

1 Acts 2:11; 2 Exodus 8:19; 3 Luke 11:20.

SIGNS. The second term, shmeia, (Greek) ’oth, (Hebrew) theologically and in our present connection the more important, is never wanting in Scripture, though used with a more limited application. It indicates that God declares Himself present in certain particular miracles, and challenges attention to His own words or the words of His messenger thus authenticated. Now, revelation has not at its great epochs been without this credential.

While the Wonderful Works are literally never absent in revelation, —always in course of procedure, open or secret, known or unknown, in miracles of nature and in miracles of grace, during the ages while the Volume was constructed and since it has been finished, for ever and

ever throughout the whole economy of salvation, —the Signs have been occasionally given at certain great and important epochs, and in confirmation, both to believers and unbelievers, of messages from heaven. It is needless to ask whether it might have been otherwise: in His wisdom God has seen fit to accompany all supernatural communications by signs and infallible tokens. But, though needless, it is not unprofitable to consider how absolutely necessary such signs and tokens must be to authenticate tidings so amazing as those which the Scripture brings. Here a few distinctions may be useful.

1. The grandest miracles which are the credentials of revelation are in the substance of the revelation itself. Very many of the extraordinary interpositions it records are not bound up with the nature and purpose of the economy of God's redeeming will, but have been miraculous attestations of individual missions. When, however, we rise from its appendages, circumstantials, and preliminaries to the Great Redemption itself, the case is different. Christ the Author of Christianity and its Substance and its End is the supreme Miracle, and everything connected with Him is miraculous. As soon as we come within the sphere, of His sacred presence the definition of miracle becomes enlarged: it is then an immediate act of Divine omnipotence which has its necessity, its reality, and its exhibition in the redeeming economy. To the central or final congregation of wonders in Him those of the Old Testament looked forward, and with them the great series virtually ended. The advent of Christ was a miracle; of which the entire history of His words and works, of His life and death, of His resurrection and ascension, is a continuation. Hence it is obvious that with regard to the Christian system as a whole miracle is essential to its demonstration. For without miracle there is no Christian revelation.

2. But, descending from this high level, we may confidently assert that the authentication of the human agents of the Divine will required such attestations from heaven as we call miracles. It may be going too far to say that the common instinct of mankind expects that if God sends a messenger He will excite attention by signs preceding and confirm His word by signs following. No founder of a human religion has ever failed to appeal to this general expectation. Confucius and Buddha and Mohammed are sometimes said to have been exceptions; but they were exceptions only to this extent, that they did not profess themselves to work miracles. Buddha was a strange anomaly in every respect. He appeared only as a reformer of an old religion, and did not found, or rather did not claim to found, a religion of his own. In other words, he needed no credentials, for he did not profess to come from God. Confucius brought no revelation: his honest task and his honest work was to revive and classify and perfect the religious literature of his people.

Mohammed pretended to no power of working miracles: wisely declining to come into competition with the true prophets of God whose revelations he appropriated and perverted. But he did bring, or assume to bring, a new revelation; and accordingly he made his appeal to miraculous messages and communications which were in the place of the miracles he could not perform. But, apart from the question of universal expectation, —which is of some importance, though not decisive, —we find that from beginning to end the Author of revelation is represented as taking this expectation into account, and as always investing His ambassadors and heralds with the credentials of miracle. The importance of these signs by which the Divine Being has authenticated the beginnings at least of every new economy of truth is sometimes undervalued. It is said to be more in harmony with heavenly decorum to communicate truth directly to the human mind; and more consistent with the dignity of truth itself that it should depend on its own intrinsic adaptation

and fitness. But they who reason thus are needlessly jealous of the Divine prerogative and of human dignity. He who knows what is in man has never offered a revelation to the race without such signs and wonders as were sufficient to establish it in the world, leaving those inexcusable who should refuse to believe.

3. This leads to the nature of the credential itself, or the value of the miracle, as it is a sign. Generally, and taking revelation as a whole, it appeals to the body of evidence that God has interposed in human affairs, in a manner transcendently extraordinary, as its plenary and abiding demonstration. That is to say, in few words, the Christian Faith rests its strong claim on this among: other things, that there is a series of wonderful works and supernatural acts behind it, around it, and encompassing it, which no sincere and candid mind ought to be able to resist. More particularly, every messenger, the Supreme Messenger not excepted, coming with professed revelation from above, has invariably been authenticated by miraculous endowments which God Himself has deemed necessary and sufficient to vindicate His servants' mission. Lastly, the miracles which satisfied the generation receiving these credentials are, as will be hereafter seen, committed to the documents which hand down the truths they taught; and the miracles and the documents together with those truths become matter of historical testimony.

4. Finally, it is obvious that the value of miracles as such, and apart from all other credentials, is to be found mainly in the authentication of the messengers to their own contemporaries. Their immediate effect on those who behold them is expressed by Nicodemus: Rabbi, we know that Thou art a Teacher come from God; far no man can do these miracles that Thou doest, except God be with him. 1 Then follows profound attention to the messenger and the message. The Sign precedes the teaching. But to after generations there is a certain change. They have the message, and its full force as truth, before they consider the miraculous attestation. We in our day include the original miracles with all other branches of evidence which are to be received on trustworthy testimony such as no lapse of ages can invalidate. But this leads to a consideration of that testimony itself, or what may be called the credentials of this Credential.

1 John 2:2.

EVIDENCES AND TESTS OF MIRACLE. The entire question of the trustworthiness of the testimony to the miraculous facts of revelation may be resolved into a statement of the criteria or tests to which these supposed facts may fairly be subjected.

1. Such Divine interventions must authenticate missions worthy of God. And it requires no argument to prove that the miracles to which the Christian revelation appeals have a cause behind them of supreme value. As a whole—from the miraculous attributes of the trees in the garden down to the ascension of the Incarnate Son of God and the Pentecostal opening of the heavens—they sustain the grand fabric of the Divine education of redeemed mankind. Here we must divert our attention from many isolated wonderful works and think only of the One Work of God upon earth. But, descending to particulars, and sending a general glance backward through all the economies, we see that the great assemblages of miracles were wrought at crises pregnant with importance to the Great Cause in the Old Testament. The ante-Mosaic miracles were authentications, not of God's messengers-only, but of His own dread Name and attributes. At the introduction of the Mosaic institute there was reason for the glorious manifestations of the Divine power, rebuking the long-endured perverseness of Egypt, authenticating the Lawgiver so slowly

accepted by His own people, proving the Divinity of what we call the Mosaic economy, and confirming that proof by signs following down to the miraculous entrance into Canaan. While the Theocracy lasted, every recorded wonder attested at the critical hour that Jehovah reigned. The miracles which cluster around the persons of Elijah and Elisha asserted His supremacy when the cause of God was at stake in the chosen land. And, finally, after long comparative cessation, there was a great, and, in some respects, unexampled renewal of miracles to rescue the sinking faith of the people during their captivity. It scarcely needs to be pointed out that the New Testament yields the same analysis. The prolonged miracle of the Divine Person, Whose deep humiliation for mankind rendered necessary the vindication of His Godhead, stands out from all wonders of the Bible as one continuous Virtue from His Divine-human presence. The Resurrection, with its infallible signs, completed the education of the Apostles' faith, and laid the corner stone of all evidences forever. The miracles of the Acts are exhibited only on critical occasions, but always then: witness the minor renewals of Pentecost for the conversion of the Gentiles, for Samaria, and for the relicts of the Baptist's ministry; lessening, as it were, through these several phases, according to the importance of the occasion. Not always however were they lessened. The resurrection-miracles of St. Peter and St. Paul followed hard on the Savior's highest acts: to demonstrate by the hand of two or three witnesses, after His rising, the fact of the victory over death which He had demonstrated most effectually by His rising itself. The abundance of St. Paul's miraculous gifts were the signs of an Apostle 1 which his peculiar vocation demanded.

And, finally, the miracles wrought in the early churches were enough and no more than enough to attest the reality of the Pentecost; being, so to speak, the same kind of confirmations of that great day as the few resurrections of the Acts were confirmations of that other day of the Resurrection proper. It must be remembered, however, that in conclusion the Supreme has not absolutely restricted His wonderful works to the great eras of revelation: the power of God, like the word of God, is not bound. We discern a certain law of miracles which seems to limit them to great epochs; but there is nothing in it which requires us to limit the Holy One, or to render it impossible that miraculous interventions have occurred since the full establishment of the organic Church in the world. Moreover, the occasional instances in which the wonders, or teras, have been wrought by the permitted agency of wicked men are so referred to in Scripture as to strengthen this credential of revelation. As Balaam in the Old Testament and Caiaphas in the New delivered sublime predictions, so the magicians in the Old Testament wrought supernatural wonders under a Divine restraint; and Antichrist, to come with his lying wonders, is predicted in the New. But the true workers of miracles in the Scripture are its holiest men; 2 and one of its closing records is the miracle that vindicates the sanctity of miraculous power upon Elymas.

1 2 Corinthians 12:12; 2 Acts 13:11.

2. It may be demanded that these wonders of the Finger of God should generally teach worthy lessons, besides asserting the power of God in the supernatural order of the world: in other words that they should be essential constituents of revelation itself, as well as being its credentials. We must not, indeed, presume to judge what in every case is the worthiness of the lesson taught: some miracles may seem too trivial, such as the recovery of the axe, 1 others too stupendously great, such as the sun's standing still, 2 for acceptance. With this reservation, it cannot be denied that the wonders of Scripture are most confessedly worthy of the cause they support. In all cases they pay respect to the very laws that they seem to supersede. They themselves effectually teach

the lessons of the Divine will and illustrate the Divine perfections. Not a miracle in the whole Bible fails to demonstrate either the power or the fidelity, or the wisdom, or the justice, or the mercy of God. They are never, or very rarely, even liable to be regarded as merely portents. All are faithful to the character of God as otherwise revealed: mingling chastisement with mercy in both Testaments, the benevolence and mercy largely predominating in the New. As it respects the miracles of Christ, the supreme miraculous credentials, they are so ordered from the least to the greatest as to teach symbolically the whole mystery of His grace, and to give illustrations beforehand of the character of His future administration through the Holy Ghost. There are a few of His miracles which have been thought to militate against our canon, and to be merely portentous or evidences of capricious severity: for instance, the consignment of the swine to death, the withering of the fig-tree, and the vehement act of zealotry in the Temple. But, read in the light of the Divine providence in the world, these acts of Jesus will be seen not only to be in harmony with the zealous severity of the Divine justice but to be almost necessary for its illustration. Seeing that the gentle Redeemer so often predicted the desolation which impenitence would bring upon God's ancient people, it might be expected that some few of His symbolical miracles would confirm His prophecies. And these seemingly exceptional cases, in which He made inanimate and irrational creatures the vicarious symbols of His displeasure, are precisely of that character. But more of this when the character of the Lord Himself becomes our Credential.

1 2 Kings 6:6; 2 Joshua 10:13.

3. It may be expected, further, that the miracles which bring the Supernatural Hand into human affairs shall, as credentials, allow of the application of fair criteria in the case of those who witnessed them, and further that they shall be supported by; sufficient evidence for posterity, (1.) As to the former, the demand may be as abundantly satisfied as the case admits.

Many of the wonders recorded in the Bible are simply matters of record, and their circumstantials are lost forever. But these may claim the benefit of being blended with the mass of those which are as it were wrought before our eyes, in the midst of all their surroundings. If the question were of the integrity of Scripture these exceptional instances might be challenged, and must be defended. But for our present argument that is needless: it is enough to assert that the grand miraculous credentials of the two covenants were wrought openly, under the cognizance of men's senses, and amidst such circumstances as forbid the possibility of deception. The miracles which accompanied the advent and legislation of Moses: were witnessed by large numbers; and the testimony of the rivals; who used their enchantments is in evidence. Of course we have only the record of Scripture itself to guide us; but for our present argument that is enough. We have all the evidence the case allows that the Egyptians as well as the Israelites saw and believed things that were not done in a corner. We have not con-temporary documents to which appeal can be made. But the entire history which flowed out of these miraculous interpositions speaks for them. From generation to generation the annals of the nation are full of allusions to what was steadfastly believed from the day of its occurrence. And the whole economy of Hebrew revelations was founded upon that faith. However, it is obvious that this question touches the Gospel miracles more particularly. With regard to them our Savior Himself may be asked for evidence. He admitted that publicity and openness and candid invitation of criticism were to be expected from anyone who claimed to bring a special message from heaven. And what He said as to His words held true of His miracles, which were His acted words: I spake openly to the world; I ever taught in the

synagogue, and in the temple, whither the Jews always resort; and in secret have I said nothing. 1 Even the Resurrection—the miracle above every miracle—was amenable to the same tests with all others; although in the nature of the case the interior mystery must needs be hidden. It was a supernatural event which men might investigate and be assured of: which indeed would be investigated with the utmost diligence. But it ought to be remembered here that the wisdom of the advocate of Christianity is quietness and confidence in a defensive or negative position. He is not bound to do more than challenge the opponent to prove that with regard to any of the recorded miracles of the Gospels, or of the Old Testament, there is the slightest vestige of evidence that anything was done which could give any ground for suspicion. But this leads to something that is more positive.

1 John 18:20.

(2.) As to the latter: we are, as posterity, in a different position, and miracles are matter of historical evidence. There are no events in the past history of the human race, which have become matter of accepted history and are doubted by no sane person, more amply and circumstantially attested than the miraculous life and resurrection from death of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ: that is, the whole range of the central miracles of Christianity.

They were not questioned at the time of their supposed occurrence; at least, the only challenge they underwent was of such a kind as to turn to their advantage. All kinds of spectators watched the more public miracles; and the only disparagement recorded was that of those who ascribed the Lord's works to Beelzebub, and His absence from the sepulcher to the cunning stratagem of His disciples. The resurrection of Jesus was the critical or crucial miracle the establishment of which would assure all the rest. Now that event was guaranteed to many hundreds of persons by many infallible proofs; it was believed from the time by a large body of conscientious and credible witnesses, whose mental and moral character sustains every test, who, moreover, to the number of hundreds sealed their conviction by an entire consecration of life, and some of them by the sacrifice of life itself. Finally, the great miracles of revelation are connected with posterity by the existence of public monuments which owe their existence to a widespread and profound confidence in their genuineness. In ancient times the Passover attested the national faith in the deliverance from Egypt, and it has continued from generation to generation to declare the strength of the evidence based upon the faith of a whole people. Similarly, the Lord's Day has declared down to the present time the faith of an immense body of witnesses that the Savior rose from the dead. And, in fact, the Christian Church as an institution vouches, if not for the reality of the miracle of Christ's life and death and resurrection, at least for the satisfaction with which the evidence of it was received from the earliest Christian generations. Supercilious skepticism may affirm that no amount of evidence can ever avail to enforce upon the mind the acceptance of facts which are contrary to the eternal laws of nature. The only reply which, at this stage, we can give is that this is quite true, if no God exists; but that, if a Personal Ruler of the universe is believed in, such supernatural facts are not incredible; and, finally, that these events were witnessed and relied upon by a very large number of trustworthy witnesses who; have sent down their evidence signed and attested to posterity.

4. Once more, the dignity of eternal truth demands that it should not lay the main stress of its demonstration on miracles: certainly never on miracles alone. No one in all the records of

revelation is represented as having made the validity of his mission depend on his works; though no one, thus authenticated, was ever known to decline producing this credential when; challenged. There is no subject connected with the evidences of the Faith that requires more careful statement than this. Exaggeration on both sides is very frequent. Certainly, it might sometimes appear as if everything was staked upon miraculous intervention: for instance, the challenges of Moses and Elijah seem to confirm this notion, as also a few of the minor miracles of both Testaments. But it ought to be remembered that the wonderful works wrought in Egypt were not merely the credentials of Moses: they were also and chiefly marks of the Divine displeasure against the false gods of that land, and chastisements of the perverseness of those who refused to obey. The same may be said of the contest on Mount Carmel. The people were bidden to choose between the True God and the false gods before the tokens came from heaven; and when these came, they took the form of chastisement, as in the case of Egypt. Merely as portents, to astonish the beholders and thus enchain their attention, miracles were never vouchsafed. But at all the great crises of revelation they have been given to enlist and pre-engage the hearers by tokens of Divine goodness and power. In fact, and on the whole, as they are the Hand of God demanding attention to His Voice, the relation of miracles to the doctrine of the Teacher who performs them is always most simply stated and guarded throughout the Scripture. The tokens when rejected are very soon withdrawn: There shall no sign be given unto this generation 1 was not uttered until sign after sign had been rejected. Moreover, it is observable that the performance of miracles becomes very occasional where the Gospel is established; and that by degrees they are taken up into the number of transitory and exceptional charisms, tokens of the Divine power for them that believe not, 2 and instruments of usefulness to those who believed. When it is said that God confirmed the word of His servants both with signs and wonders and with divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost 3 we must remember that the stress is laid upon the last clause. And our Lord’s prediction and promise of the greater works than these 4 to be wrought by His Apostles, and of the miraculous tokens to be expected by believers, were not intended to be understood of a permanent authentication of the Gospel by miraculous tokens. But this takes us back to the Supreme Witness Himself, Who has left many testimonies to the true place of miracles among the credentials of His Faith. Nothing is more certain than that He appealed to His works as fulfillment of prophecy, and as proofs of His own Divine power and authority. He also made them the vehicle of teaching His most impressive lessons, and of encouraging His servants’ faith in the goodness of His heart. Our Lord also declared that His miracles rendered unbelief inexcusable: If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin. 5 But the works include, if they do not mean, the words: If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin.6 And accordingly His most solemn testimony as to the responsibility of His generation was: the word that I have spoken the same shall judge him in the last day. 7 Finally, there are two other passages in St. John which will repay careful study. Though ye believe not Me, believe the works: 8 this places the works in their due subordination, while giving them their value. Those who ought to believe, because of the works, ought rather to have believed because of the virtue that proceeded from Himself. The works which the Father hath given Me TO FINISH, the same works that I do, bear witness of Me that the Father hath sent Me: 9 this gives the glorious Gospel, as one whole finished in Christ, its supreme place as the final and consummate evidence of the truth of revelation.

1 Mark 8:12; 2 1 Corinthians 14:22; 3 Hebrews 2:4; 4 John 14:12; 5 John 15:24; 6 John 15:22; 7 John 12:48; 8 John 10:38; 9 John 5:36.

5. Lastly, there is a criterion or postulate which believers in revelation add to those already considered. The miracles of Scripture, in their wide variety and unbounded grandeur, are the economy of a SUPERNATURAL ORDER. As they must, therefore, be in many respects dimly apprehended by the limited faculties of men, it may be expected that there will be residual difficulties, remaining as the test of faith. Among these difficulties we do not reckon the supposed evidence of modern science in favor of a fixed and unalterable reign of law, any interference with which is in itself not to be conceived. Law implies a Lawgiver, and the Supreme Author of all laws may interpose when and how He will. Moreover, so long as man has the evidence of consciousness that he can control for a season the action of natural laws, the exercise of his own volition being independent of any previous merely natural cause, it will be impossible to persuade him that the Infinite Personal Will cannot interpose amidst the sequences of nature. But there are other difficulties. Such is the occasional want of seeming reason for a supreme intervention; concerning which, however, it is enough to say that we are not fit judges on this question.

Again, the undeniable occurrence of prodigies such as witchcraft and necromancy and the performance of wonderful works through the agency of evil spirits, are sometimes a stumbling-block to faith: only however to a faith which does not admit, what the Scriptures everywhere testify, that such things as these have been permitted by God for reasons to a great extent incomprehensible to us. Finally, the question of the continuance of miraculous signs since the days of the Apostles presents a topic of difficulty. But the difficulty vanishes if it is honestly admitted that there is no reason why the Supreme should not still manifest His power in endowing His servants occasionally, whether with the gift of prophecy or with the gift of miracle. This granted, the question becomes then simply matter of evidence. All these and other seemingly unsolvable problems become to the believer in the supreme miracles of the Incarnation and the Resurrection no more and no less than trials of humility and intellectual submission and faith.

PROPHECY.

PROPHECY, as one of the credentials of revelation, is, like Miracle, bound up with its very fabric. It is the Divine law of the gradual disclosure of that system of truth which is ever expanding throughout the Scriptures from stage to stage unto perfection. As such, the term has two meanings: one wider, according to which it is the immediate declaration of the will of God through His servants, whether as to the past, or the present, or the future; and one more restricted, according to which it is the prediction of future events in connection with the great economy of revealed truth.

PROPHECY MORE GENERAL.

1. Prophecy is the utterance of Divine revelation; and a prophet is one raised up and sent to communicate God’s truth. The meaning of nabiy’ is an Announcer; and that of chazah, is Seer, the earlier name of the same office, or one who receives what he is to utter in visions. The visions were not universally characteristic of the office; but the office itself, and the employment of it throughout the whole economy of revelation, is one of the great credentials of the Bible, as pervasive as the miracle, with which indeed it is indissolubly bound up, being only one aspect of a

continuous Divine intervention in human affairs. The prophet was not an ordinary announcer of the will of Heaven, like the priest who might read and expound the law. He was an instrument of the Divine will raised up out of the order of nature, to receive communications which may be called supernatural, being imparted by an influence of the Holy Ghost sometimes called Vision, sometimes the Word of the Lord: for instance, The word of the Lord was precious in those days; there was no open vision. 1 Whether by exhibiting to the interior eye the scene, or by lodging the word in the thoughts, there can be no doubt that the Author of revelation performed what in another domain would have been a miracle, every time that the Man of God 2 or the Man of the Spirit 3 was sent forth with his burden of revelation.

1 1 Samuel 3:1; 2 Genesis 20:7; 3 Hosea 9:7.

2. The essence of this credential of Divine revelation is this, that it represents every communication from God as directly imparted by a Divine afflatus, the influence of which the prophet could not mistake, and the reality of which the people might test. This direct contact of the Spirit of God with the spirit of man is the pervading law and the pervading glory of the Divine revelation from Moses downward. There is nothing resembling it in the history of perverted religions. So far as the oracles, soothsayers, and diviners of heathenism offer any analogy, it is only as a foil to the grandeur of this credential. It is thus spoken of by the voice of Jehovah Himself. When Miriam and Aaron murmured against the superior dignity of Moses as the prophet of the Hebrews, they said: Hath the Lord indeed spoken only by Moses? hath He not spoken also by us?1 and it is recorded that Jehovah came down in the pillar of the cloud, and stood in the door of the tabernacle; . . . and He said. Hear now My words: If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make Myself known to him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all Mine house. With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches; and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold: wherefore then were ye not afraid to speak against My servant Moses? Here we have, as it were, in epitome, the entire mystery of the prophetic gift and function; and in such a manner as to exhibit the strength of this credential most impressively. It is the Voice of Jehovah, jealous of His own honor and of the honor of His servants, at once describing and defending the prophetic law of revelation. We mark that there was to be a permanent order of these agents always ready—whether as a school of the prophets or still abiding in their callings—for the high service of the Kingdom. To one of them Jehovah would reveal Himself whether in a more extraordinary manner or otherwise, in such a way, however, that the receiver of the vision should have no doubt: I the Lord will make MYSELF known unto him. 2 Yet the Supreme was not limited to any order of men or to any special method. Hence we find that, while the Seventy Elders received the Spirit and prophesied and did not cease (or but not further] ,3 the same Spirit rested also upon Eldad and Medad and they prophesied in the camp. Above all minor ministries rises Moses supreme: with him Jehovah spoke face to face. Yet he was not strictly supreme: being only the type and precursor of that Prophet, like unto him yet greater than he, with whom in eternity the Father speaketh face to face: the SON over His own house. 4 When this Son came, the ancient order of prophets ceased; for the Supreme Revealer made every one of His Apostles like Moses, and spoke to them face to face. Moses could never communicate the Spirit received by him; for we hear him say: Would God that all the Lords people were prophets, and that the Lord would put His Spirit upon them.5 But our Lord Himself breathed on His Apostles His own Spirit. And thus the whole sum of revelation is

under the sublime law of a direct manifestation of God to His people through His servants. This is the grand and glorious claim of revelation from beginning to end, from Moses to the Greater than Moses.

1 Numbers 12:2; 2 Numbers 12:6; 3 Numbers 11:25-26; 4 Hebrews 3:6; 5 Numbers 11:29.

3. We find everywhere, however, the most careful provision for the vindication of this credential. The interior consciousness of the prophet was the guarantee to himself that the Lord was with him; this however could not be transferred to others, and is no argument to unbelievers who regard the entire mystery of the prophetic function as a delusion. But Jehovah gave His people tests by which they might verify the claims of these prophets.

Those whom God sent could appeal to the fact that the honor of Jehovah was their supreme end. What our Savior said concerning Himself was true of all who had come before Him, and of all who should follow Him. My doctrine is not Mine, but His that sent Me. If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of Myself. He that speaketh of himself seeketh his own glory.1 This test may be applied to the company of the prophets, and, if applied with candor, will result in the conviction that such a body of men could never have imposed a series of delusions on their own people and on the whole world. But this is not all. These men were fortified by two other qualifications. They were sometimes armed with the power of working miracles, as in the case of Moses and Elijah, Sometimes also their credential was the utterance of prediction: When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken.2 This, however, leads to that second and more limited meaning of the word which has almost displaced the former.

1 John 7:16-18; 2 Deuteronomy 18:22.

PROPHETIC PREDICTION.

Prophecy is thus more specifically the impartation of a Divine knowledge of the future to man: that is, it embraces the prediction of future events. All revelation from the beginning has been prediction unfolding into prediction. This, we have seen, is its law; concerning which no more can be said than that the God of revelation has so willed it. We can imagine it otherwise: every generation might have been taught its lesson, as based upon the past, but not including the future. But we are shut up to the assumption that revelation is the progressive disclosure of one great event to which the eyes of all generations, as well before it; as after it, were to be directed. Moreover, according to the testimony of Scripture itself the prediction of future events followed by the accomplishment of those predictions has always been one of the Divine methods of authenticating revelation. Here then we have the general laws of prophecy proper, and its criterion; as a credential. THE GENERALLAWSOF PROPHETIC PREDICTION.

There are a few general principles the study of which are of great importance in order to a right estimate of Scriptural prediction as a distinct and pervasive credential of revelation.

1. The first is that CHRIST IS ITS SUPREME SUBJECT: the Object to Whom give all the prophets witness,1 directly or indirectly, from generation to generation, till He came; and for Whose return, now that He is gone, all the predictions of Scripture wait. The Redeemer Himself declared that the Scriptures were to be searched because they testify of Me: 2 if whatever else might be found in

them this was their supreme matter. The testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy. 3 His Person, advent, and kingdom give to all the prophecies of Scripture their unity. The great catholic all-embracing predictions which pervade revelation concerning the accomplished redemption of mankind, from the Protevangelium, or first prediction with promise, downward, are everywhere found; each new cycle of the prophetic inspiration pays its tribute to that great design of the coming Deliverer. While no prophet is ever heard to foreannounce his successor, all conspire to foreannounce the Christ. We cannot always see the connection between the lesser predictions and that vast accomplishment; but we do see that the running superscription of prophetic revelation is the final kingdom of the Redeemer. All types, which are prophecies in act, and all predictions, which are prophecies in word, have a more or less obvious reference to the Gospel. To discover this we often have to apply what is called the Canon of a Double Sense; that is, a first accomplishment nearer at hand, which itself suggests a second and ulterior satisfying all requirements: a combination worthy of the Divine attributes, and resembling in the free domain of history the use of symbols in nature; the events to which the predictions first refer being themselves prophetic of Christ. In due time we must examine the predictions of the Old Testament more in detail.

Meanwhile, all that is necessary here is to dwell on this law as stamping the credential character of prophecy. There are indeed predictions in the Old Testament—such as those minutely describing the destruction of some of the ancient cities of the world —the accomplishment of which is known and read of all men who study history. They must not be forgotten. But whoever examines the New Testament carefully will see that the whole strain of allusion to the Great Fulfillment of the fullness of time points to the coming and kingdom of Jesus as the one accomplishment that guarantees all the rest. There is nothing more certain in the annals of mankind than that a series of predictions runs through the ancient literature of the Jews which has had a most exact fulfillment in the advent and work of Jesus. This is the supreme credential of prophecy in revelation.

1 Acts 10:43; 2 John 5:39; 3 Revelation 19:10.

2. Another unfailing evidence of the Divine presence in the prophetic Scripture is the peculiar law of PROGRESSION found to pervade them: a law which determines the steady development of the great doctrine of revelation according to certain fixed principles.

Every age is under the sway of some governing prophecy the accomplishment of which introduces the government of a new order of prophetic expectation. The fulfillment of one prediction becomes the starting-point of another, with wider issues and a larger number of subordinate tributaries.

(1.) It may be said that one transcendent prophecy begins the Scripture, commands the whole of revelation, and binds time and eternity in one: the first Gospel of a coming Redeemer. But even this illustrates, like all others, that largest application of the principle which divides the whole series into the Old-Testament predictions and those of the New.

All the ancient prophets spoke of what Isaiah, in their name, calls the Last Days, 1 or the great AFTERWARD, that indefinite period of Jacob’s prophecy, achariyt hayaamiym, which began to be more definite in the opening vision of the evangelical Prophet, It shall come to pass in the last days. 2 The coming of that glorious After Age, or the ends of the world, or the world to come, the Fulfillment, is the fullness of time 3 generally.

Particularly, it is stamped with perfection in the New Testament by three tokens: it is the time of the last days when God spoke His perfect revelation in HisSong of Solomon 4:1-16 and imperfect oracles were consummated by one Final Voice; secondly, when He who was foreordained before the foundation of the world, and testified beforehand, was manifest in these last times, 5 as the spotless Lamb of the Finished Atonement; and, finally, the period of the last days when the prophecy was accomplished, I will pour out of My Spirit upon all flesh. 6 These three events fill up the perfection of the Second Period of redemption: the Voice of the Son, the Atoning Blood, the Effusion of the Spirit. And with Christ, the Supreme Fulfillment, begins a new order and range of prophecy what eternity is to time that His coming in the new economy is to the expectation of Him in the old. In fact, the very same language was adopted by the ancient Rabbins to distinguish these: the time of the Messiah was the WORLD TO COME.

1 Genesis 49:1; 2 Isaiah 2:2; 3 Galatians 4:4; 4 Hebrews 1:2; 5 1 Peter 1:11; 1 Peter 1:20; 6 Acts 2:17.

(2.) The same principle may be traced in the subordinate cycles throughout Scripture. The patriarchal predictions, while always faithful to the first law and keeping the Messianic age in view, terminated in Canaan, to begin again with an altogether new order of prophecies. The predictions of the Jewish prophets, so far as they referred to the Captivity, found their accomplishment in that event, the first goal of the largest of all clusters of foreannouncement; but with that accomplishment another series emerged into prominence. Similarly, there are, in the New Testament, subordinate cycles of predictions out of the accomplishment of which other predictions arise. Over the Incarnation there was a large array of prophetic songs, pointing to the Advent but including also its ulterior results. Our Lord's own predictions referred to His death and resurrection and ascension; to the outpouring of His Spirit, the establishment, of His kingdom, the destruction of Jerusalem, the final resurrection, and the end of the world: the largest and most comprehensive series of predictions delivered by any one Voice since prophecy began. The same law is latent in the Apocalypse, the last book of prophecy; but here our eyes are holden, and it is not given to those who now read to trace its operation otherwise than in broad outline. The more this general principle is studied, in its application to the entire mass of the predictions of Scripture, the more glorious will appear to all dispassionate students the economy of prophecy which the Omniscient Mind has ordered. Whatever it may be to those who are bent upon resisting all evidences that recommend the Word of God, to those who are OF THE TRUTH this law of foreannouncement will itself be a strong credential of revelation.

3. Once more, and pursuing the same topic a little further, all prophecy is under the law of RESERVE; a mysterious law which has been appointed in the Divine counsel, and has literally never been changed. In its absolute supremacy it governs the development of revelation: this being the difference between time and eternity, that in the latter alone will all restriction be done away Neither What nor What manner of time 1 as ever been fully made clear until the day has declared it. It is evident that this might have been otherwise. The same Spirit Who foreannounced the Coming of the Christ could have so described His Person, so unfolded His work, and so defined the period of His advent, as to remove every vestige of uncertainty. But this was not His will. He so ordered every prediction, and every cycle of predictions, that, while enough was declared to encourage hope and excite desire, enough was concealed to shut up the heirs of prophecy to faith.

Looking back upon the long series as irradiated by the light of Pentecost we see that every general and every more particular prediction had its determinate reference to the Great Fulfillment; but we can see also that not one of them was clear enough to preclude unbelief in the case of those who were disposed to murmur against Divine Providence.

Every generation could rejoice in the fulfillment of the prophecies that had gone before concerning itself; but as to its own future it was under the sway of an indefinite hope.

There is no exception to this law throughout the economy of prophecy. When it was approaching its Old-Testament close, it might appear as if the law was somewhat relaxed; for Daniel's predictions are exceedingly minute, and their specifications of the Seventy Weeks, and of the peculiarity of the last week of the Seventy, goes beyond the general indeterminateness of prophetic utterance; but his prophecies are no real exception, having been until the Messiah came almost as indeterminate as the date of the Millennium. The New Testament introduces the same law, and is everywhere faithful to it. Reserve begins again; and it reigns over the expectations of the Christian church at the present hour. Our Lord's foreannouncements of His passion were veiled in a certain obscurity; and it was not until after His resurrection that even the THIRD DAY was understood. Even when approaching the seventh of the weeks before Pentecost, and giving His disciples their last encouragement, the Savior says only Not many days hence, 2 though we might suppose that the tenth day would be certain to all. As soon as the Holy Ghost begins a new cycle of predictions concerning the coming again of Jesus, with all the subordinate fulfillments of prophecy connected with that event, we mark that we are under the same restrictions as the fathers were under. We have the immeasurable advantage of the accomplishment of the greatest prophecies concerning Him in the First Advent; hut the times and the seasons of the Return are still under a veil. We have, like the ancients, to inquire diligently what, or what manner of, time the Spirit of the Christ did signify. 3 Nor have we a right to expect until the Lord comes a more clear and full revelation of the millennial events than the fathers had of the Advent of the Redeemer. Now this law of a strict reserve is itself a glorious testimony to the wisdom and goodness of the God of revelation: especially when it is connected with those we have already referred to. For, to sum up, all prophecy points to One Supreme Person, like the needle to the pole, and with only the same tremulous variation; all proceeds in the majestic march of a determinate counsel, but in spiral cycles; and over all, including that under which we live, there is the same veil of heavenly mystery. Like every past generation, we also are in the hour of a great Expectation: an hour or a day which is rich with the inheritance of a vast fulfillment, but richer still, if possible, in the hope of a yet more abundant inheritance hereafter when the time of its perfect revelation and enjoyment shall have fully come.

1 1 Peter 1:11; 2 Acts 1:5; 3 1 Peter 1:11.

4. Finally, an important law of all prophetic announcements is that it has been constituted by the Holy Spirit a sign to every successive generation: in other words, like the miracle proper, and equally with the miracle, it has been a Divine credential of revelation. In the unlimited wisdom of the Supreme the prophetic office was ordained to subserve many purposes. It was the medium through which the supreme communications were, from time to time, made to the chosen people, of encouragement or warning to themselves, and of defiance and threatening against their enemies. Hence for a long series of ages it was the vehicle of the entire economy of Divine

instruction: containing the doctrines and the ethics of the religion common to all dispensations, with a glorious prospective announcement of the Christian truth hereafter to be revealed. Hence the prophetic books, and the prophetic elements in all the other books, are to us an inexhaustible fund of instruction apart from their predictions of future events. But, all this being true, it is equally plain that the whole system of foreannouncement was intended to be from generation to generation a standing and permanent credential. There is abundant evidence of this in all parts of the Old Testament. And if thou say in thine heart, how shall we know the words which the Lord hath not spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken. 1 Long afterwards we read: Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else: I am God, and there is none like Me. Declaring futurity from the former time, and from ancient times the things that are not yet, done. 2 To this our Lord gives His own sanction for the New Testament: And now I have told you before it come to pass, that when it is come to pass ye might believe. 3 1 Deuteronomy 18:21-22; 2 Isaiah 46:9-10; 3 John 14:29.

THETESTSOF THE PROPHETIC CREDENTIAL. THE TESTS of prophecy are very simple. They are, strictly speaking, not the moral character of the prophet, nor the worthiness of the matter, nor the preservation of the record, nor obvious connection with the Divine scheme: these are all implied characteristics which have been already dwelt on in another connection. But the prophecies which are the credentials of a revelation ought to be such as to satisfy their student that they can be accounted for only by Omniscience; they should be beyond the suspicion of a mere human fulfillment: and they must of course, in order to be; prophecies, precede their accomplishment.

1. It is undeniable that the prediction of future events is the prerogative of Omniscience alone; and also that in the Scriptures; God is represented as making it one great purpose in His commission of the prophets to establish clearly this claim. We may suppose therefore that the predictions of Scripture will generally, if not in all individual and isolated cases, have such a character as to be beyond the reach of human calculation. It may safely be granted that in some cases it is impossible to prove the event foreannounced to have been beyond the range of skilful foresight. But it must be remembered that the weight of the argument from prophecy does not rest upon isolated examples: it depends upon certain great and prominent and vast predictions such as only the Supreme Mind could have given to men, and the accomplishment of which is before our eyes. Beginning with these, and fortified by their undeniable strength, we have only afterwards to stand on the defensive with regard to the rest: nothing is necessary beyond establishing that the opposite conclusion cannot be proved. First, then, let this test be applied to that One Great Object of prophecy to Whom all the prophets bore witness. During a thousand years a perfect picture is gradually drawn, by more than a hundred distinct predictions, of One Person, and of Him as unique in the history of mankind: that distinct picture being the filling up of an outline which had been sketched thousands of years before, in fact from the very beginning of the world. Could the Deliverer of mankind have been foreseen in all the marvelous traits of His character, and in all the minute circumstances of His appearance and history and life and death and resurrection and reign, by the enthusiasm of national longing? Could the converging foresight of a series of prophets have drawn this most elaborate and most sacred Portrait? The same may be said as to the steadfast predictions of the fates of some of the leading nations of the world. After the Person

of the Messiah, the Israel after the flesh which rejected Him takes the next rank in the historical perspective of prophecy. There is a similar wonderful unanimity in the predictions of their entire history whether as originally Hebrews, or afterwards Israelites, or in more modern times Jews. Their destiny as depicted in the Bible, that is in both Testaments, brings prophecy and fulfillment into such plain and undeniable harmony that no room ought to be left for infidelity. This is a topic that must be pursued through the whole Bible, which shows that the rejection and dispersal of the people was foretold when it was most prosperous, its elevation and dignity when it was most dejected. Moses, the founder of Hebrew greatness, foretold the dispersion of Israel as the result of their disobedience, and at the same time their preservation through all ages as distinct and unconfounded among the nations. Scarcely one of the later prophets but has repeated this wonderful prophecy, applicable to no other race. The nations among which they were scattered have disappeared, or are in course of disappearance: the ten tribes are wanderers over the face of the earth still. They have survived the greatest revolutions of history: a standing proof that the Eye of the Supreme foresaw what His omnipotent Hand has accomplished. Though I make an end of all the nations whither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make an end of thee. 1 And, as to those other nations themselves, the prophetic Scriptures abound with predictions, more or less minute, the fulfillment of which has proved that the voice of God uttered them. It was foretold, again and again, that the covenant people should go into captivity: that the captives should be again set free, and those who spoiled them be themselves laid waste. A minute study of these prophecies will show, and the more minute the study the more effectually will it show, that Omni-science was in these predictions. Hosea, Amos, and Isaiah pre-dieted that the kingdom of Israel and Jerusalem also would be scourged by Assyria; and it was so. The fulfillment was exact as to the ravage of Samaria, and the restraining hand that saved Jerusalem from destruction. In the year 712 B.C. Nahum denounced ruin against the Assyrian oppressor and Nineveh: in the year 612 B.C., after a century which had given no signs of this, the destruction of Nineveh took place.

Concerning Babylon also, the successor of Assyria, there were equally sure words of prophecy. No fact in human annals is more certain than that the Babylonian captivity was foretold by Isaiah, and also the deliverance of the people; nor than that Micah, two hundred years before their accomplishment, predicted the same events. The burden of Tyre in Isaiah described its ruin, by the Chaldeans in a manner so clear and explicit, and so fully confirmed by history, as to make it one of the triumphs of prophetic evidence. But for confirmation of the evidence the prophecies themselves must be carefully studied. This branch of the Apologetics of revelation is only glanced at in this general summary; it will amply repay the most exhaustive examination.

1 Jeremiah 30:11.

2. As the first test pays its tribute to the Omniscience of the God of revelation, so the second pays its tribute to the Omnipotence. Only He Who gave them could fulfill the predictions of Scripture. But it has been urged by the opponents of the Faith that many of those so-called vaticinations which undeniably are found in the rhapsodies of the prophets were really fulfilled; but fulfilled through the determination of those who were interested in their accomplishment that they should be accomplished. It is pleaded with great subtlety that patriotic enthusiasts, gifted with keen foresight, gave hints of what they saw in the germ of probability; and that these hints fulfilled themselves. It is not a hopeless, nor is it even a difficult, task to vindicate the whole body of Old-Testament foreannouncements from this charge. But it most concerns us to examine it in its

reference to the New Testament, where it is applied, with some show of plausibility, but with no real force, to the Supreme Fulfillment of all prophecy. The spirit of infidelity does not shrink from making the career of Christ a studied adaptation to Himself of the scattered prophetic hints of the ancient records. It seizes upon the Scriptural word, that it might be fulfilled; 1 and boldly assumes that the entire history of our Lord and His kingdom in the New Testament was a cunningly devised fable, 2 woven after the pattern given in the Old Testament. It is scarcely necessary to say that here lies the stress of the whole argument against the Christian revelation as resting upon the fulfillment of prophecy. We may remain for ever in doubt as to the precise relation of some of the obscurer predictions of the prophets to their fulfillment: the doubt is simply the result of our ignorance of many of the elements necessary to its solution. But it is a matter of vital importance, the very life of Christianity is in it, that our Lord's manifestation on earth should be a fulfillment of what was provided and foretold according to the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God; and not a studied assumption of a character and destiny sketched in the enthusiasm of national hope. Here we must needs argue in a circle: it is the first necessity, as will be hereafter seen, that, as we believe in God, we believe also in His Son. And He rests the whole issue of His mission, with all its boundless interests to mankind, upon the accomplishment of the entire prophetic word in Himself. He has appropriated all the leading foreannouncements of the Messiah to His own Person. But, in His own application, and in that of His Spirit in the Apostles, there is a distinction to be observed. While all the major prophecies are referred to as absolutely accomplished in His mission—beginning with His incarnation and ending with His final return—many of the minor prophecies are said to be fulfilled in an accommodated sense. The formula that it might be fulfilled 3 applies to some events which accomplish prophetic types: such as Out of Egypt have I called My Son: 4 and, Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, In Rama was a voice heard. 5 The same principle may be applied to many quotations from the ancient prophets: in Christ and His kingdom all types and predictions found as it were their natural and legitimate resting place. But it must be remembered that, if the Supreme Fulfillment is in Christ, His authority must protect all the prophets who wrote of Him: protect them, not only in their general authenticity, but also in the detail of these most obscure predictions. The two prophets against whose mission and specific prophecies infidelity has most vehemently excepted are Isaiah and Daniel; and these are precisely the prophets whom Jesus and His Apostles most emphatically quote. They are safe therefore in our estimation for the Master's sake.

But, speaking generally, they are safe in their own integrity. Their leading foreannouncements were such as could never have fulfilled themselves, nor have been fulfilled by those who artfully seize upon these hints. Have the nations and empires whose overthrow was predicted and accomplished, fulfilled the predictions by their own cunning? Are the Jews executing on themselves the judgment written? They are the most determined enemies of the Christian Fulfillment; but they do not deny that the hand of God has been long against them. He has smitten them, they think, for the chastisement of the world's peace; and wounded them for the transgressions of mankind; but surely they have not smitten and wounded themselves in order to fulfill predictions bound up with their own disgrace.

1 Matthew 1:22; 2 Hosea 11:1; 3 Matthew 2:17-18.

3. The test of prophecy takes yet another form. It is very confidently asserted that some of the avowed predictions of Scripture were written POST EVENTUM: after the supposed

accomplishment. To prove this in the case of any of the least of these predictions is a task which has not succeeded; in the case of the greatest of them, that is of those on which the burden of the credential lies, it has been a hopeless failure. But the spirit of infidelity is very bold: as daring in its unholy attacks as the spirit of faith is daring in its acceptance of mysteries. From the earliest assault on prophecy down to modern times the whole force of its attack has taken this direction. Disintegrating the Scriptures as a whole, utterly renouncing the traditions of ages, and attaching no weight to the testimony of Christ and His Apostles, of the Jewish and Christian churches from the beginning, it scruples not to make the Pentateuch a Mosaic tesselation of documents to which Moses has only given his name, which indeed belongs to a period subsequent to the Captivity; and the voices of the psalmists and prophets, from Samuel and David to Joel and Zechariah, are regarded as singing strains which turn history, past and present, into poetry with a prophetic form. The Book of Daniel is declared to have been written after the leading events which it records, these being mainly predictions concerning Antiochus Epiphanes; while its remarkable miracles are supposed to prove its unauthentic character as well as later origin. It has been seen that the Lord has thrown His shield around this prophet; He mentions him by name; receives from him His Messianic designation, Son of Man, and that of His kingdom, the kingdom of heaven; and generally protects him by anticipation against all assaults. The Lord's own apology is sustained by the best modern research; and, after the utmost critical sifting, its most vehement opponents have no argument to allege but the extreme minuteness of its prophecies and the supernatural hand in its events. The Holy Gospels contain predictions of the Supreme Prophet; and they also are therefore assigned, in spite of the strongest evidence of antiquity, to a period after the destruction of Jerusalem. In this case also our loyalty to the Lord almost forbids argument. If Christ Jesus be worthy of any confidence the main predictions of the Old and New Testaments must have been delivered before their fulfillment. As to a multitude of lesser prophecies, about which there may be contention, the application of our test, and the consequent vindication of the prophets in detail, will require the close study of prophetic Scripture as a distinct branch of theology. But that minute investigation is not necessary to show the triumph of this particular credential of revelation as such in its broad outlines. Doubtless the New Testament followed the Old, and the Old was not written after the event. The dispersion of the Jews, the spread of Christianity, the ruin of the great empires whose burdens rest upon the prophets, the signs of Antichrist, the latterday infidelity, —all are fulfillments of distinct prophecy, which assuredly was written before their accomplishment.

PROPHECY AND MIRACLE. The evidence of Prophecy as a credential of revelation is of the highest order: whether taken by itself or in connection with miracle generally.

1. In common with miracle proper it is a standing and perpetual token of the Divine presence in the whole sphere of revelation. He Himself appeals to both as His high prerogative in many of the sublimest passages of the prophets. I have declared the former things from the beginning; and they went forth out of My mouth, and I showed them; I did them suddenly and they came to pass. 1 It was the Voice Supernatural, beyond the ordinary methods of guiding man's inquiries, that declared all coming events from the beginning: nothing worth calling history has taken place without foreannouncement. And it was the Hand Supernatural, beyond the ordinary and quiet operation of Providence in nature, that SUDDENLY brought it to pass. The boundless variety and steadfast unity of these predictions give them an unspeakable, grandeur; and the wonderful events in human history which are the direct fulfillment of prophecy are beyond all others great in

all the elements of sublimity. In fact, if all the events which have been matter of fulfillment and of prophecy are eliminated from the current of human history there is not much that is left. The leading transactions of every age have been under a ruling prophecy; and we also, in our day, wait to see the end of the things that concern ourselves.

1 Isaiah 48:3.

2. Viewed apart, and by themselves, these prophecies are peculiarly cumulative in their demonstrative force. Unlike the miracles, the fulfilled predictions constantly enlarge the materials of their evidence. There is a sense indeed in which this observation, frequently made, is not true. The miracles recorded in Scripture are thought to be more feebly commended to the acceptance of every succeeding generation; as if the testimony on which they rest grows weaker as it recedes from the present. But that is not philosophically true. Moreover, the most evident and noblest miracles—if any such distinction may be made—are yet constantly performed; and the Finger and Hand of God are evermore at work in the hearts of men and in the heart of society. Still, the accumulating force of the prophetic credential is more conspicuous than that of the miracle. We live under a vaster amount of fulfillment than any former age; and he who shall take the historical prophecies of the Old Testament and trace their fulfillment in the course of Oriental history will have an irresistible demonstration of Christianity at his command.

3. Finally, like the miracles, the prophecies are bound up with the teaching of the Bible; and, apart from their evidential force, yield an unlimited treasure of instruction in the ways of God, the work of Christ, and the destiny of man. Neither miracle nor prophecy can easily be over-estimated as the vehicle of Divine teaching: neither can be while time lasts exhausted.

INSPIRATION, OR THE DIVINE HAND IN SCRIPTURE. The specific doctrine of inspiration, as the ground of the Divine authority of the Scriptures, will be considered in its place. It may here be regarded very briefly as one of the credentials of revelation, on a level with Miracles and Prophecy and completing or consummating their evidence.

1. Inspiration is a distinct element of the supernatural order of revealed truth: one of its laws and characteristic attributes. As such it simply means that the sacred documents are worthy of the Divine Author; and that they are not unworthily described as

GODBREATHED.

Strictly speaking only the writers are inspired; but the last word on the subject in the New Testament gives the epithet to Scripture itself: Pása grafeé Theópneustos 1 What we have agreed to mean by inspiration is therefore the fact that God has interposed to keep a continuous and abiding record of truth in the world: this, throughout all the ages of the world's religious history, has been the Divine method of imparting and preserving the knowledge of God among men. The beginning of this interposition, so far as concerns the written documents, is lost in the distance of ages; but none of its fruits can be supposed to be lost. Inspiration is, in a certain sense, one with revelation, as meaning the Divine bestowment of knowledge that could not otherwise be acquired. It does not, however, entirely coincide with revelation: being either less or more: less, since much that has been revealed has not been transmitted; more, since much is recorded and transmitted that was not given by direct revelation. But, whatever may be its limits, it indicates a specific intervention of God in human literature, through which there has always been in course of

production, and has been finally produced, the permanent and authoritative revelation of His mind and will to man. And this may fairly be regarded as a credential of the whole system of revealed truth: it is worthy of the Divine wisdom, and what might have been, humanly speaking, expected, that He whose power has been known in miracle, and His knowledge in prophecy, should declare His wisdom and fidelity in giving revelation to mankind, and in making it an abiding heritage. Now revelation makes this its universal claim; and appeals to the manifest evidences of the Presence of God, as its Author and Indwelling Spirit, in Holy Scripture. Such is the overwhelming demonstration of this, that the whole weight of the cause of Christianity might be made to rest upon it, if it be rightly stated and exhibited. The entire scope and contents of the volume of inspiration justify its pretension to have come direct from heaven. When the character of Jesus is introduced, and the moral and spiritual effects of His Gospel, we shall have to consider much that might be supposed to belong to this credential. But there remains a very interesting argument that may be briefly touched upon here.

1 2 Timothy 3:16.

2. Generally speaking, the records of revelation are worthy of their Divine authorship or of the Divine authorship which they claim. Dispassionately taking up the whole Bible, with the hypothesis in our thoughts that it was composed by writers under a special control of the Holy Spirit, we find nothing, or very little, to make us hesitate in admitting the claim; but, on the contrary, perpetual demonstration that the several authors cannot have been left to themselves. The children of this Wisdom justify her on the whole; and where they seem to do otherwise it is only that we cannot penetrate the secret which makes any one of them say, in the language of St. Paul, I speak as a fool. 1 1 2 Corinthians 11:23.

3. For, it must be remembered that the records of revelation exhibit a characteristic Divine-human excellence corresponding with the only sound theory of inspiration. They are worthy to be assigned to the authorship of the controlling Spirit: supposing that Spirit to employ human faculties and human editorship. They may not be at all points, in every line and every record, what we might expect from the immediate dictation of the Holy Ghost, or from the writing of His Finger on tables delivered to man. But, if they are below what God might be supposed to send down straight from heaven, they are certainly altogether beyond the unassisted ability of man, higher indeed than any ability of man, even assisted from above, could have produced: that is to say, there are disclosures in various parts of the Bible, and one in particular everywhere, which imply not the raising of earth to heaven but the descent of heaven to earth. We have only to contemplate their tranquil, authoritative solution of questions that no other books have attempted even to investigate; their profound and natural familiarity with God and the things of God; the simplicity and awfulness of their doctrine of sin; the supreme moral interest that everywhere reigns; and their universal, never-failing appeal to what is good in human nature, as if a Divine Voice were issuing from them for ever speaking to something in the human spirit that must hear. If God records His truth for man, this is just what He would write: whether we have respect to what is given or to what is withheld. There is a perfect Divine dignity and perfect human purity: it is both the Voice of God and the voice of man; combined in so marvelous a way as to make the claims of Inspiration rightly understood a most impressive credential of the Faith.

4. Hence the simple and undeniable fact of the supremacy of the Bible, as a collection of religious documents, may be appealed to as itself a mighty presumptive argument of its own truth and of the truth of the religion it propounds. There is nothing parallel, nothing similar, in human literature. Place it by the side of the most ancient religious books, the Indian Vedas, the Chinese Classics arranged by Confucius, and the other sacred writings of the world at large, and comparison must soon give up its task. Soon give it up: not immediately; for there are undoubtedly certain outlines of primitive truth in the ancient writings of the East which show that they also were written not without a certain degree of the Divine afflatus. The Holy Ghost has ever been the Voice of One crying in the wilderness, and saying. Prepare ye the way of the Lord. In the books which treat of the Science of Religion, and give us systems of Comparative Theology, more than justice is done to this element common to the sacred books of what we call heathenism and the Holy Scriptures: so far as mere justice is done, the advocate of Christianity heartily assents, but when the other holy writings are collated with the Christian at all points it is an exaggeration of justice that becomes most unjust. The Bible refuses to form one column of a great Biblical Polyglot. There is outside of the Christian Scriptures no document extant among men which really professes to have been written under the inspiration of God: and among those which may seem to make such a claim there is not one which does not in half its contents refute the claim, common sense being the judge. Again, there is no document of the kind extant for which it may be pleaded that, though as standing alone it has no divinity, it recovers its character when placed in a collection of sacred books. But there is not a book of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures which does not vindicate its own dignity and sanctity at all points when studied as belonging to the entire volume. This leads however to a distinct argument.

5. The Unity of the Scriptures of revelation is a very strong credential in its favor as professing to be from God. It is one great vision, and its interpretation one: beginning and ending with the same Paradise, with thousands of years of redeeming history between. It has been instinctively called, what it does not call itself, the Bible: one Book divided, if divided at all, into two parts. That the New Testament as fulfillment should so perfectly correspond with the Old Testament as prophecy is in itself the most wonderful phenomenon in literature: it is evidence as near demonstration as need be of the intervention of a Divine Hand. The Redeemer made manifest in the later Scriptures answers face to face and feature for feature to the Form predicted in the older Scriptures. But it is not merely that the Same Being is foreannounced in one book Who comes in another. He is the sole predominant subject of many books in both departments of the Bible. One idea runs through the whole: the kingdom of God set up or restored in His incarnate Son. To this idea authors of various ages and of various races contribute in a harmony which never could be the result of accident or mere coincidence. Only the Divine power could have made so many men, of different lands, concert, without concerting, such a scheme of literature. These men belonged to no school of consecutive writers: yet they seem as if they had been, before time was, in the counsel and councilchamber of Jehovah, and to have come forth each predestined to furnish his own contribution. If they had not asserted their inspiration of God, that hypothesis must have been invented to account for the facts and phenomena of their writings. But they have asserted it: the claim is bound up with every page of the word they have left behind them.

6. There is a special aspect of this argument which will be found of great importance by those who examine it from this point of view: that is, the unity of teaching which is maintained through a long

and diversified course of development. The leading doctrines which distinguish Christianity from every other system of supposed religious truth are to be traced through the many books of the Bible in a line of ever widening and everdeepening expansion. Each prominent article of our Faith may be traced upwards to its germ in the earliest Biblical documents, and downward again as it threads its way distinct from others until it finds its full expression. And all combined converge through the older Scriptures to a consummate harmony in the New Testament. These two facts are undoubted: they ought not, at least, to be doubted by anyone who is familiar with the history of doctrine in the Bible. The Holy Trinity, with the redeeming relation to mankind of the Second Person in that Trinity, and the relation to the universe of life sustained by the Third Person; the establishment in the world of a kingdom of grace destined finally to triumph; the acceptance of every penitent sinner by God on the ground of what is called a Righteousness of Faith; the essential difference between soul and body, with the transient separation caused by physical death; the eternal issues of the present life of probation;— these are all doctrinal truths which run through the whole Bible, so that Christian preachers may take their proof-texts from almost every book; but which run through the Bible with always progressive clearness. The development of doctrine we have to study elsewhere. It is referred to now as a clear indication of the presence—perhaps it would be better to say of the very strong probability of the presence—of a Divine Hand in the construction of the Bible. The supreme truth—that of the Sacred Trinity in the Godhead— might be shown to bear up the pillars of this argument. There is not a single reference in the Old Testament to the Messiah as a Person near to Jehovah, or as Jehovah Himself, that is not perfectly consistent with the amazing secret concerning His being which the New Testament brings to light; nor is there a single reference, among multitudes, to the Spirit of God that is not perfectly in harmony with what the later Scriptures declare as to His relation to the Father and the Son. Such is the effect produced on the devout mind of a believer in Christianity by the consideration of this wonderful harmony that he is disposed to place it among the foremost evidences of the Faith. Most certainly it is one of its most emphatic and persuasive credentials.

7. It must be remembered that the argument based upon the presence of the Divine Hand in the construction of the Bible is not exhibited as final and demonstrative: it is, as has just been remarked, only a credential hard to resist. Here a few further observations may be made which will suggest hints to be followed out by the student himself to any extent.

(1.) There is in this no more demonstration than the analogical argument generally presents. Throughout the works of God— granted that the creation is a work of God— we perceive the universal sway of a law of evolution, qualified however by a subordinate law of occasional interventions that seem to break the former. Precisely what we find in nature and in providence we find in the gradual construction of Scripture. Why it should be so, it is vain to ask. That it is an absolutely valid proof of the Divinity or supreme authority of the Bible it is vain to assert, It might by the most wonderful of all coincidences have happened that such a Book should be composed at long intervals by authors independent of each other, and retain such a character of steady, uniform, evergrowing development. But the probabilities against this would have been exceedingly great.

(2.) Again, it must be borne in mind that the Divine influence and agency in Scripture is not asserted to be absolute and unqualified. What was said as to the miracles, and might have been said as to prophecy—that residual difficulties were to be expected in the nature of the case—may

be said of the credentials of inspiration. Objectors frame hypotheses of miracle and prophecy with which the facts are not found to accord: and they are offended.

So, also, they frame hypotheses of inspiration with which the records of revelation cannot be harmonized: and they turn away with suspicion. This subject will be more fully discussed when we come to the doctrine of inspiration. At present it is enough to say that there is in the human elements of the workmanship of Scripture nothing utterly inconsistent with the supposition of a Divine Hand overruling and controlling and even arranging the whole compass of sacred literature.

SUMMARY.

These three credentials of Miracle, Prophecy, and Inspiration ought to be united: they mutually give and receive strength, and are strongest when they are combined. The miracle is of course most demonstrative to the extant generation of beholders, the prophecy is of course demonstrative only to the generations who come afterwards. The present generation in the midst of which miracles are wrought cannot hand down to us in the fullest degree the evidence of their senses; we who behold the fulfillment cannot send back to those who heard the prophecy our vision of accomplished prediction. Inspiration embraces the two in one: it records the fact of the miracle, and, as inspiration, makes it present to every age; while, as inspiration, its record of a prophecy makes the fulfillment as if it were already come or were already past to those who hear it. This may be made plainer by applying it to the narratives of our Lord's mission. Throughout the holy Gospels Jesus is found working miracles and uttering prophecies. When His works and His words were alike approaching their close, He predicted the coming of a miraculous power which should provide for the permanent record of the whole: He promised the Spirit of inspiration Who was not only Himself to abide with His disciples but also to cause the Lord's words to abide with His Church. Certainly the Savior when He gave this assurance uttered a prophecy, which was fulfilled from the Day of Pentecost onward; while the prophecy predicted a miraculous effusion of the Holy Ghost Who was to be a Memory within the disciples' memory, and a special expositor of their Master's words. And the fulfillment of the prophecy was the Spirit of inspiration through Whose influence and superintendence the Four 'Gospels were written. But these three are more or less united throughout the history of the Bible: they have never been disjoined since the construction of the Biblical Library began. Strictly speaking, it was prophecy which commenced, miracle abundantly followed, and in due time inspiration provided one permanent record. The three have kept pace through all the ages of revealed truth; and they ended together, when their common work was done. Yet they have not ended. In the Bible miracle, and prophecy, and inspiration abide: but in some respects the greatest is inspiration; for it really absorbs the two others, and gives continuance and permanence to the whole. THE CHARACTER OF CHRIST THE REVEALER. The Person of Jesus Christ, the Author and Finisher of the Faith, is its highest and most sacred credential. This is true of our Lord's historical manifestation generally; but for our present purpose it will be sufficient to regard Him as the Founder of His own religion, and to mark the perfect consistency with which He supports His claim to be the Incarnate Revealer of all truth. The more closely we examine the Four Gospels the more clearly shall we perceive that He Himself in His Divine-human self-consciousness rested upon this for the enforcement of His claims: not only in the case of those who were around Him in the flesh, but also throughout all the future. The strength of this argument as such will be found to be only increased by the various explanations from time to time devised to resist it. There is no rational way of accounting for the Person and

Work of Christ but that which accepts the Divine origin of Christianity. THE SUPREME CLAIM.

Here we have reverently to consider the claim of Jesus, the Supreme Revealer, and the consistency of His teaching with His claim: both these being viewed as completely exhibited in the Christian revelation as a whole.

1. The Savior's testimony to Himself is not to be gathered from any one of His assertions, but from the entire strain of the Gospels, as these are corroborated by the exposition of His Apostles. The sum is, that He came down from heaven as the Son of God, and appeared on earth while still in heaven as the Son of man, to reveal the words of His Father and to accomplish His Father's, will, for human redemption. There is nothing parallel to the pretension of Jesus; nothing like it ever entered into the mind of man. The anticipation of mankind had never risen to such a conception: scarcely had the Old Testament itself prepared for it, Jesus is the Incarnate Son of God: this fact, or this claim, entirely rules the new dispensation. For the Christianity which does not bring this credential we do not plead: such a Christianity has descended to the level of other religions. It might almost be said that the very claim is a sufficient credential. That such a Being as Jesus of Nazareth undeniably was —so lowly and pure, so unselfish and reverent, so mighty in word and deed, with such irresistible power over all who approached Him—should declare Himself to have come down from heaven with the mysteries of eternity, with eternal truth in His words and eternal love in His heart, is itself something so new and transcendent that it might almost take our faith captive at its will. This is the thought of those who are already His. But it is a sublime credential which provokes the unbelief of the unregenerate reason, and must defend itself.

2. There is no more wonderful characteristic of our Lord's revealing mission, and no stronger assertion of its divinity, than the absence of everything that might place Him on a level with other teachers, or with men generally. From His first word to His mother in the temple down to His prayer before the cross, there is not a single expression uttered by Himself which, fairly interpreted, makes Him a member of the fellowship of the human teachers of mankind. Nor is there a single expression in the New Testament which, fairly interpreted, makes Him a member in common of the human race.

(1.) It is true that on some few occasions Jesus spoke as a man, and seemed to ally Himself with the Rabbis around Him. To Nicodemus He said, We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness: 1 thus contrasting himself with the Master of Israel as the teacher of a new doctrine, while in some sense identifying Himself with his order. But it must be remembered that He immediately added: No man hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man Which is in heaven: 2,3 thus, the very sentence which appears to conjoin the Redeemer with His own Apostles, in which He indeed uses almost the words that both St. Paul and St. John apply to themselves, is that which contains the very loftiest assertion of His Divine authority as a Teacher. It is the new Teacher Who says that He is THE SON OF MAN WHICH IS IN HEAVEN.

1 John 3:10-13; 2 2 Corinthians 4:13; 3 1 John 1:1.

(2.) Further, and it is of great importance, our Lord never once allied Himself with mankind in any such way as would be inconsistent with the infinite peculiarity of His claim as His Father's Representative in the human race. The more deeply this fact is pondered the more wonderful will it

appear, and the more mighty as a credential of the Christian Faith. Though His delights were with the sons of men, 1 and He so identified Himself with the human family as to elect for His own lips the name SON OF MAN, yet in every variety of way He distinguished Himself from the descendants of Adam. IF YE, BEING EVIL, 2 is only one instance out of many with which the Gospels make us familiar.

Whosoever studies the question in all its bearings will find that in this fact is one of the most effectual internal evidences of the truth of our holy religion.

1 Proverbs 8:31; 2 Matthew 7:11. ITS JUSTIFICATION. The full exposition of the character of our Lord in all His offices must be reserved. But there are some reflections which arise from a general review of the history of His revelation of Himself, and of the truth in Him, which will set this sacred and central credential in its proper light.

1. Though it is undoubtedly true that nothing in human history runs parallel with this claim of the Redeemer, it is found to be in strict harmony with the profoundest desires and instincts of the race. Not indeed that the incarnation of the Son of God had ever been anticipated. The loftiest aspiration of the religious spirit in man had never aimed so high. The transcendental philosophy which makes the Infinite and the finite two necessary poles of thought finding their axis, as it were, in the union of the Absolute and the Conditioned in Christ could never have existed if the Gospel had not given it the idea. The difference between the modern and the ancient Pantheistic philosophy is to be traced to this: Hegel and the moderns have ploughed with the heifer of revelation, that is, of New Testament revelation; for scarcely did the Old Testament disclose this deepest secret of the counsel of God. Whatever approximations towards the idea of a personal union between God and man, exhibited in any one historic person, are to be found in the ancient or modern systems of religious philosophy lack, as close scrutiny proves, the essential element of the Christian incarnation. They never conceived, nor did they approach the conception, of a real and permanent union of the Divine and human in one personality.

Yet the very distortions of the truth are profoundly suggestive. They are like the magicians' imitations of the miracles in Egypt: permitted exhibitions of what man's fantasy will do with Divine truth, when Satan is the teacher and not the Holy Ghost. But to return The manifestation of our Lord among men—the Son of Man and the Son of God in one—was the pure and perfect realization of the highest unconscious longing of human nature: that of seeing the Divinity reflected again in itself as a mirror. He was in that sense also the Desire of all nations. 1

1 Haggai 2:7.

2. Christ's personal character, if such language may be used, is in precise harmony with the assumption of so unheard of a relation. It is a character of which it must be said that it is neither altogether Divine nor altogether human: it is Divine-human; with the perfection of God in it, but exhibited in the life of a man. Human holiness has in Him its consummate ideal: judged indeed by a standard that He has set up; one however that our own reason approves. Following Him throughout His career, and forgetting so far as we can His Divinity, we mark that every act and word, and believe, are constrained to believe, that every thought also, is consistent with His assertion that Satan had NO PART IN HIM. 1 When the Savior was tested by the Enemy in the wilderness He neither asserted nor denied His sinlessness; but the answers He gave were

precisely those which a perfect human nature would have uttered. It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. 2 When He was maligned by His foes among men He simply challenged all accusers and defied them: Which of you convinceth Me of sin? 3 As He approached the cross, where His atonement; required His absolute sinlessness, He spoke most explicitly. The prince of this world cometh, and hath NOTHING IN ME. 4 It is, of: course, utterly impossible, in the nature of things, to demonstrate the absolute sinlessness of Jesus as man. None but God can: pronounce upon that. But it must be remembered that, according to the assumption of the whole New Testament, Jesus was more than man. His holiness is essentially Divine holiness. That is, it is a holiness which is guaranteed by the Divinity of the Son of God. The miraculous conception insured the sanctity of the human nature; and the Divinity of the Son insured the permanent necessity of that sinlessness. Hence it was Divine sanctity.

We see that it is not a holiness that has retrieved itself, that our Lord's resistance to temptation is not that of one who can fall, that He does not speak of law and of duty save as a God. In short, the religious character of the Savior is Divine-human: it is what God, supposing Him also man, would exhibit; and that is all the argument requires.

1 John 14:30; 2 Matthew 4:4; 3 John 8:46; 4 John 9:30.

3. The Incarnate mission of Jesus is conducted precisely under such restrictions as are consistent with the twofold nature of His one Person; and this alone we have a right to demand. All His works and all His words are Divine. The universe is under His authority: there is a sense in which we see all things already put under Him. And nothing can be more certain than that our Lord claims to know everything pertaining at least to human destiny: as the impression produced in our mind is that supreme power is at the Savior's command, so also we feel a conviction that He has unlimited knowledge. In Him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge: 1 hidden in the deepest sense of the term. Both these truths our Lord impresses in His own heavenly manner, not yet understood by those who heard: The Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He seeth the Father do: for what things soever He doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. 2 These words speak of what is an Eternal Vision, and of what is an Eternal Power. But there is a strange reserve in the Redeemer's assertion of both: yet not strange, however mysterious, to those who understand, or rather believe in, the Lord's wonderful relations to God and man. This power is, as it were, held by Him in trust and sometimes fettered by some transcendent restraint; this knowledge is a hearing of the Father, first in eternity, and then gradually enlarging in human faculties. Of the unfathomable mystery that is here it is needless to speak: only of its consistency with the claim, amazing beyond all human conception, of the Founder of our faith.

1 Colossians 2:3; 2 John 5:9.

4. Christ's style of teaching exhibits the same harmony. It is, on the one hand, perfectly after the manner of men. He uses human documents, quotes them humanly, and adopts the purest arts of human rhetoric. His presentation of truth as a Teacher is simply the highest in human literature. But it is absolutely Divine: those who are drawn by the cords of a man, for instance, in the beginning of the Sermon on the Mount must be constrained to own at the close that they have heard the voice of a God and not of a man. We feel that His dealing with the conscience is not that of a human witness, nor of a sanctified human teacher, but of a Judge, Who not only gives laws

and administers them but also demands of all who hear Him an account of their conduct. No one can read carefully the Four Gospels without feeling that the Master of Christian doctrine and morals is more than man. It may be sometimes matter of doubt whether the Teacher is one to whom in an extraordinary manner the Divine authority was delegated, or Himself the Divine Son of God. But there can be no doubt whether or not the Voice of Jesus speaks with the confidence of a final Revealer of doctrine and Arbiter of duty. And the very doubt to which reference has been made implies the pure humanness of His ministry. The two sides of His teaching character—the one expressed by the people's question. How knoweth this man letters, having never learned? 1 and the other by our Lord's own self-revelation, My Father hath taught Me 2—are harmonized in the Redeemer's claim as avowed through His whole history, but on no other principle can they be reconciled.

1 John 7:15; 2 John 8:28.

5. The end and consummation of the Savior's whole work reveals this credential in its infinite clearness and force. The Founder of Christianity Himself lays the chief stress of His appeal to mankind on His redeeming mission, and His atoning death. It must be expected, therefore, that in the crisis and culmination of the incarnate history—that is, in the transactions connected with the death of the cross—the deep secret of our Lord's Divine-human nature would be exhibited in its most impressive way. Accordingly, we observe that in almost all the details of our Lord's suffering and death there is evidence that the Victim of manifest human violence and of hidden Divine justice is both human and Divine. He approaches His passion as a man: the Man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief, 1 is only a man of deeper sorrow and more profoundly acquainted with grief than other men. Looking at Him from our human position, we see that He advances to the end like any other martyr: He had His distant dread, His Gethsemane foretaste, and then the very bitterness of death itself. By those who looked at Him with only human eyes He was regarded naturally as the first of all confessors: perfect in meekness as towards enemies, perfect in lowliness of heart as before God, and perfect in self-sacrifice as bearing the witness of blood to His mission. But by those who beheld Him from heaven—He was seen of angels 2 —it was regarded as a more than mortal passion. The Eternal Father had again and again declared that the Sufferer was His Eternal Son: as when He sent Him down from the mount of transfiguration, and when He acknowledged Him before the wondering crowd in the temple. So also the centurion near the cross, and the disciples who watched Him afar off, bore their witness. These testimonies, however, may not be accepted by all as the credentials of Christ: their value is felt only by those who accept the heavenly origin of the Gospels, and already believe in the Divine-human Person of the Son. But the naked strength of the argument is felt by those who watch the Great Sufferer of Christianity, and mark very carefully the union of Divinity and humanity in the Savior's own sentiment, bearing, and words. According to His own sacrificial Prayer, His death was a voluntary self-sanctification: to be an offering the virtue of which should expiate the sin of the world, to reveal the Divine glory in the redemption of mankind, and through that revelation to secure His own return to the glory of God. No testimony borne by our Lord to Himself is plainer than that which declares Him to have died not as men die; but to have suffered as the Son of God, appointed in the Divine counsel to save the race by dying for it. The entire economy of Christianity is based upon this. It stands or falls with the security of this foundation. The Person Who claims the confidence of men, and demands that they entrust to Him their eternal destiny, asks their absolute submission only as

their Divine-human Redeemer. His credentials are not perfect till they are delivered from the cross. And His apologists, who plead His cause, affirm that every incident and word of the history of the passion, like the great passion itself, is consistent with the Savior's claim. There is a calm undertone of Divinity in all the human experience and testimony. The Lord declared beforehand the circumstances of His death, and after a certain period made His disciples familiar with that cross the sight of which afterwards appalled them so much. He spoke of His enemies as having no power against Him of themselves; of the hosts of angels as ready to defend Him if He should only call them to His aid; and of the whole passion generally as a foreordained event that nothing could avert from Him though He accepted it with perfect spontaneousness. It is profoundly true that the credentials of Christianity come in all their strength from the passion week and the eve of the cross. Humanly speaking, and supposing the Sufferer to be only a perfect man, we may claim for the death of Jesus a dignity and a pathos of which there are few examples in history and no rivals. He set His face steadfastly to go to Jerusalem, knowing what awaited Him there; and, though He might have escaped—for the leaders of the people evidently wished to give Him the opportunity—He deliberately arranged everything, down to the minutest particular, for His own end. His disciples' safety was in His thoughts, and provision for His mother, and for the daughters of Jerusalem only less dear to Him than she was, at the very time that He was meditating on the world's salvation. During the same hour that He was pouring out His triumphant prayer in the expectation of His glory, as if the suffering of death was over, He was in the profoundest anguish of Gethsemane, holding in His hand the cup which He drank with seemingly more fear than Socrates felt when his cup was in his hand. But an infinite difference is manifest between the cups. There was a bitterness in the Redeemer's agony which no man hath felt or could feel. It was the endurance of that curse on human sin which the Christian economy ascribes to Christ, and the absence of which makes the history of the end of Jesus unintelligible. We take the three Gospels and perpetually feel that there is something more than mortal in His sufferings. We add to them the fourth, and we perceive the secret of the mystery. To have invented such a combination of the suffering and triumphant Messiah was altogether beyond the power of such men as the Evangelists. It had been the labor of Jewish Rabbis for ages to disjoin the two: the interpretation of inspired men alone could unite them thus. The Spirit of Christ in the Prophets could only signify the passion and the glory that should follow. But the Spirit of Christ in the Evangelists teaches them to see the suffering and the glory blended in one hour, the hour and the power of redemption. That two such aspects of His death are found in the same Gospels requires the agency of the Spirit for its explanation; and His explanation is that the Savior was delivered up by the wicked counsel of men to the wicked hands of men, on the one hand, and that on the other, He died by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God. Meanwhile He, as at once God and man, yielded Himself up both to the will of man and to the will of God His Father. Here all is evident though incomprehensible consistency with that supreme claim on which all the stress is laid, and those who are of the truth must feel the force of this most sad and most glorious of all His credentials.

1 Isaiah 53:3; 2 1 Timothy 3:16.

6. Once more, it must strike every thoughtful observer of Jesus, and hearer of His words, that the peculiar character of His predictions concerning the future of His cause upon earth is in strict harmony with His Divine-human claims. Almost from the outset of His manifestation it is obvious that the Teacher of Nazareth speaks of that future with two voices that are really one: that is to

say, on many occasions it might seem as if He were sent to make a great experiment, the issue of which would depend upon His servants' fidelity; while, on many other occasions, He spoke in the full consciousness of the accomplishment of a Divine purpose the end of which was known to Him as clearly as the beginning. There can be no doubt that these two aspects of our Lord's prevision are manifest everywhere. When the Son of man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth? 1 was His question to the disciples concerning a special kind of faith that He constantly inculcated, a faith, however that He bids His disciples to regard as rare in every age, and probably—to them but not to Himself— to be rare at the last. This is only one specimen of many passages in which the Savior seems to look out upon a vast contingency. The harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few; Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that He will send forth laborers into His harvest. 2 Here we have another. But there is a much larger number of His sayings in which there is no contingency expressed or implied. Such are all the purely eschatological discourses, where the program of the future kingdom is sketched in its broad outlines with a firm hand. There is no more clear and definite history in the Bible than the future of the last day, evidently as present to the Divine Teacher in the Gospels as the day on which He speaks: whatever may be thought of the authority of the writers of the New Testament, it is certain that without a single exception they represent to us a Savior Who beholds at once the sum of things, declaring the end from the beginning, 3 and has before His eyes the whole panorama of human history. Certainly it was not His will to disclose all because, in the unfathomable mystery of life, what is present to the Supreme is to the creature a yet unformed future dependent on himself. Hence the Savior's predictions of the events of the long interval—the times and the seasons—are given in general terms. That there was to be a long interval He always implied: especially in the kingdom-parables. That it was to be a diversified interval of struggle He showed also: / am come to cast fire on the earth; and what will I if it is already kindled? 4 The disciplinary furnace was already heated; before its fiery process began among men it must begin at the house of God, and even with the Son in the house: But I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished! His disciples might expect it to be otherwise: Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division: for from henceforth—a term that always stretched from the present to the last future—there shall be five in one house divided, three against two and two against three. The two aspects of the future—that in which it is a fixed issue, and that in which it is a varied contingency—are strikingly combined in the Lord's reference to what He termed the day of His appearing. While in general the expression refers to the final advent, it is certain that the Lord Himself comprehended under it the entire space of the interval: the several critical events—such as the Pentecostal visitation and the destruction of Jerusalem, and the many indefinite crises indicated in the Apocalypse—were the day or the coming of Christ. This must be studied more fully in its proper place. Meanwhile, it is enough to point out in how wonderful a manner the Savior's predictions of the future of His cause and kingdom confirm His claim to be the incarnate but Divine Revealer of the Father's will and Author of the Christian Faith.

1 Luke 18:8; 2 Matthew 9:37-38; 3 Isaiah 46:10; 4 Luke 12:49-52.

7. This leads, however, to another view. The provision made by the Founder of Christianity for the continuance of His cause or kingdom on earth exhibits the same tokens of consistency with His Divine-human character. The human provisions are throughout perfect in their calm, deliberate foresight. The Seventy and the Twelve were carefully chosen: the former to prepare the Lord's

own way in a transitory manner, and accordingly with rules for their guidance not adapted for permanence; the latter to pave the way for His Gospel among all nations after His departure; and accordingly with a long-continued discipline the perfection of which appears throughout the Gospels. We see also that while the Lord speaks of a kingdom over men He is also preparing for a Church gathered from among men: its foundation is laid, and the Two Sacraments—the most wonderful expedients in all legislation—appointed for the initiation and abiding test of worthy membership. Besides these two fundamentals of ecclesiastical order many other regulations were made. In fact, nothing was left unprovided for: every hint and germ develops afterwards into profound significance, fitted into a perfect system. But the provision is at all points Divine; and in truth its adaptation depended upon the Lord's own survival and victory as God over death and continuance in life. All was made to rest, further, upon a heavenly Substitute for His visible presence, Whose glorious descent from heaven, a Messenger from Himself, is as clearly before the Redeemer's mind as His own descent through death to the world of spirits. This argument—for it is really such— requires to be studied with care, especially in the light of the final discourses in St. John. Can anything be conceived more grand or sublime than the Savior's tranquil committal of the interests of His kingdom to Another Divine Person, for whose advent He had made all necessary preparation? The idea of a divided function— His own in heaven and the Spirit's upon earth—is one with which we are so familiar that we are apt to lose our sense of its perfect uniqueness. If it did not come from above, it could not have come from below. If its origin was earth, then never did earth produce so strange a thought before. In other words, the great future is humanly provided for, but under Divine conditions, by one and the same Incarnate Head of our religion.

8. We might trace still further this marvelous chain of consistency, the links of which are the credentials of our Lord's mission. But the best apology of the Christian Religion for ever keeps the Person of its Founder in view and considers the combination in Him of Divine dignity and human humility. The claims of Jesus to the homage and devotion of men are at all points exactly what might be expected of Deity Incarnate, but to be accounted for on no other assumption. Without that great pre-supposal all is obscure and incomprehensible : that being admitted all is harmonious and worthy of acceptation. In our Savior's character as the Head of a religion are seen in marked distinctness the two sides. There is a series of records which represent Him as one of ourselves, and even as claiming to be the Refuge of the weary because He could say, I am meek and lowly in heart; 1 and such a most tender human atmosphere the history breathes to the end. But this same Jesus everywhere claims, both from His foes and from His friends, all that God might exact: the former He threatens with His own displeasure, as if there could be no fear beyond that; while from the latter He demands perfect love and creaturely consecration. There is nothing like this in the history of mankind. Such a twofold relation of One to others—of a human Head to the members of His community—is absolutely alone in human affairs. The purest, gentlest, and most abstracted of men, whose deep devotion to heaven and unselfish spirituality cannot be for a moment even brought in question, nevertheless addresses those who seem to be His fellows as their God and their Judge. On the one hand, He displaces Moses, 2 who was the meekest man on earth, and becomes Himself the pattern of humility. 3 On the other hand, His holy wrath surpasses the jealous anger of Moses who rebuked the people and died for his impatience. The Woes of Jesus are as historical as His Benedictions. 4,5 But, after all, the noblest argument for the consistency and truth of the Savior's claims is the calmness with which He asks for the undivided homage of

every heart. He Himself makes the sum of religion the perfect love of God; and then claims perfect love for Himself: here upon earth as there in heaven it holds good that I AND MY FATHER ARE ONE. 6 1 Matthew 11:29; 2 Numbers 12:10; 3 Numbers 20:10; 4 Matthew 5:1-48; 5 Matthew 21:1-46; 6 John 10:30.

9. We complete the chain, thus feebly held and traced, when we point to the inexpressible influence of the Savior's character, both while He was upon earth and since He has gone into heaven If He came down to this world, the Eternal Son in the flesh, and delivered these credentials of power and goodness, and died for us as the Incarnate Lover of our souls, we might expect that His Divine-human ascendency over men would be supreme and permanent. No one can read the four Gospels without feeling that the sway of Jesus of Nazareth over those who came within the sphere of His influence was strictly answerable to our hypothesis. To none was He an object of indifference; no one ever crossed His path, or exchanged words with Him, who was not thenceforward a different man. It is impossible to account for His supremacy over all on any human principle. The narratives that record it are too artless and simple to be suspected of depicting a mere human hero: they have no air of embellishment, and rather understate than exaggerate.

There is not a sentence in them that calls attention to the character or works of Jesus as their subject. They simply record facts, and leave those facts to produce their own impression. We follow the steps of the Redeemer; and mark that His influence on all men is precisely what the influence of God incarnate would be. If the recorders of His life had purposed to describe such a Being, supposing them able to form the conception and to execute it, they could not have better accomplished their task. The scene with the doctors and His parents in the Temple, the conclusion of the discourse on the mountain, the testimony of those sent to entangle Him, the various accounts of His colloquies with His disciples, occasional intercourse with individual strangers, and controversies with the malignant Jews, with the solemn pathos of awe which He inspired into every person who had to do with His death, all conspire to prove that the Jesus of the Gospels is always consistent with His claims to be the Incarnate Son of God.

Never man spake like this Man!1 never man was loved, reverenced, adored like this Man! The sentiments inspired by this Son of the Blessed are to those who love Him testimony to the Divinity of His claims. And it has been permanent. There is nothing possible to the Supreme that the name of Jesus has not accomplished during the Christian ages. His name through faith in His name has evoked a stronger and a purer enthusiasm than any other; and it is the only one that has evoked it among all races alike. Wherever the Gospel is preached and received Jesus is accepted as the Son of man Who is the Son of God: accepted with a fervor and confidence which no human qualities could account for. No mere man ever was or could be received with such an equal devotion: with that kind of catholic recognition which regards Him not as a Jew or an Oriental but as the Man Who belongs to all men. But the vast majority of those who have received Him have received Him as their God: the exceptions have always been few. He has received a Divine devotion through all generations from His own people; and been hated as only Divine excellence can be hated. He is still God manifest in the flesh: 2 by far the most influential power that has ever been known in the affairs of mankind.

1 John 7:46; 2 1 Timothy 3:16.

HYPOTHESESEXPLAINING THE MANIFESTATION OF CHRIST.

Many have been the attempts to give an account to human reason of the most wonderful phenomenon in all human history: that is, to parry the force of this argument, the most precious and the most effectual of all that Christianity has to bring forward. It has been felt by friends and enemies alike, that this is the inmost stronghold; and consequently both the most determined assaults and the most resolute defense have been found here. A few remarks may be made on the methods adopted by infidelity: the student will perceive that the consideration of these methods will tend only to strengthen our position.

1. It is remarkable that the Gospels, which contain predictions of the entire future of the Redeemer's kingdom, very accurately predict, both by word and in act, the kind of assault that would be directed against the name of Jesus. During our Lord's sojourn on earth the representatives of every subsequent speculation spent their surmise and questioning upon Him, and the representatives of every subsequent attack are found confronting Him. The colloquy between the Master and the disciples at Caesarea Philippi throws much light on the divided opinions of the generation. Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, ?Amos 1:1-15 was a question once asked and still continued from age to age. It teaches significantly that the opposition excited among His contemporaries took the form of hypothesis concerning His Person. His enemies pondered rather Who He was than what He was. Although sometimes they strove to impeach His moral character, as one who broke the Sabbath, or who stirred up the people, or who was too familiar with sinners, generally they aimed at the mystery of His relation to the Father: either avowedly pointing to His known Nazareth family, or darkly hinting at a supposed compact with Satan. Anyone who should collate and study the opinions of His contemporaries concerning Him will find the germs of all subsequent opinions and treatment. From that day Jesus has riveted on Himself the regards of the whole civilized world. And it may be safely affirmed that all speculation on the Founder of Christianity has had reference, expressed or unexpressed, to the mystery of His Incarnate Person. This most strange phenomenon—the Form that seems so much like the Son of God—has to be accounted for in some way by those who reject Christianity. They must confront and salute this Figure: it may be with fear or with scorn or with reasoning doubt; but never with indifference.

1 Matthew 16:13.

2. The methods of infidel resistance to the claims of Christ have been very various; but usually they have wavered between two sides of an alternative: while all accept the reality and in a certain sense the truth of the Record, some have labored to find flaws in this Image of holiness, or, if they have not disparaged the Lord's character, have aimed to prove that it exhibits nothing beyond human attainment; while others, despairing of this, and leaving His character untouched, have made it a picture drawn by the enthusiasm of His disciples vying with each other in laying on the Picture touches of perfection. What more has to be said definitely on these points will be only briefly indicated: reverence imposes a restraint as to the former class; and future discussion of the Person of Christ will introduce much that might otherwise be said on the latter. THE PERSONAL CHARACTER OF JESUS. Our Lord's personal character, whether in itself or in relation to His mission, has been brought into controversy from the beginning: but with very different subordinate objects, and on very different principles. Generally, the assault has been negative or positive:

either the absolute sinlessness of Jesus has been denied, or some positive moral impeachment has been ventured on.

1. Negatively, it has been asserted that the sinlessness which Christianity imputes to its Founder is simply and absolutely an impossibility. Concerning this assertion it is enough to say that it pays an unconscious tribute of high importance to the fact that our Savior's claim to be, in virtue of His Divine personality, eternally and essentially what His servant calls Him, Separate from sinners. 1 It is felt by most sincere opponents of the Christian revelation that Jesus is presented to us by His Evangelists, and by Himself through their record, as One in Whom there neither is nor could be any taint. St. John gathers up all testimonies in one Indefinite Present: In Him is no sin. 2 Some there are who do not admit that such a claim is made: many sincere Christians, for instance, think it necessary to the perfection of our Lord's human nature that it was possible for Him, under pressure of temptation, to have fallen; and many unbelievers suppose that Jesus went no further than a challenge to His enemies to prove against Him any moral evil. In either case, they take it for granted that He shared the common infirmity of mankind, and make their comments accordingly. Some, at whose head stand the French Encyclopedists, and the German author of the "Wolfenbuttel Fragments," regard him as an impostor who made piety a mask: having failed to secure the empire of Judaism he changed his: mote, and said that his kingdom was not of this world. Others suppose that he was only the first and greatest of Christian enthusiasts who have mistaken ardent zeal and high devotion for sinlessness. Later infidelity has been more respectful than the earlier, and has been content to allege that the exemption of Christ from sin is fatal to the claims of Christianity: since He was truly man, and all men are sinners. The Christian theology which meets such an argument by saying that Christ might have sinned but did not sin, plays into the enemies' hands. The best, and indeed the only, reply is that the Head of the Christian Faith was tempted of evil in His human nature, which was conceived and born without sin; and that He was incapable of falling because His human nature had no personality independent of His Divine nature, which rendered sin impossible.

1 Hebrews 7:26; 2 1 John 3:5.

2. Positively, the elements of our Lord's character have been analyzed, and found to be wanting in some attributes essential to perfection. This is a chapter in our Apologetics which the Christian mourns to approach, and would fain make very brief. He can see no spot in the Lamb of God; and the more he studies the character of his Master the more fully persuaded is he that it embodies all perfection. But many who say that they are dispassionate critics come to a different conclusion. The Savior's asperity against His enemies; His avowed indifference to ascetic practices, and disrespect to the conventional morality which would separate a Rabbi from convivial assemblies and prevent his numbering women among his disciples; His recoil from sufferings and from death; His vacillation during the last days of His life; the bitterness of the final Woes uttered before He left His people; these are features in which—by recent English Infidelity, to its disgrace—He has been counted less great than some of His own disciples. But there is no difficulty in answering these objections. As to the Lord's indifference to the conventional ethics of the time, it is enough that we adopt His own defense. As the Lord of the Sabbath He relaxed the prescriptive observances which had clustered around the day; as the Lord of the Temple He acted there as men did not generally act; and as the Lord of all proprieties He made Himself the Friend of publicans and sinners. Moreover, as His morals were well known to be strict in principle co the verge of rigor, it was His

good pleasure to show in practice that the wisdom which cometh from above is justified of all her children: that her severity is not asceticism and her abstracted-ness from created things is not indifference to the welfare of mankind. The Savior did indeed bow under the burden of His unfathomable Messianic sorrows, and His human part shrank from the bitterness of that death which was prepared for Him. But to shrink from death is not necessarily to fear it: the Redeemer only paid a tribute of salutation to the enemy whom He came to destroy. Moreover, his eyes must be holden indeed who does not perceive that in Gethsemane, as distinguished from Calvary, the question was of something infinitely more than death. On the cross, in the presence of multitudes of witnesses, no infirmity is betrayed for a moment: in the garden before the cross there is a most mysterious and incomprehensible struggle of the Incarnate Redeemer which points to the sacrificial endurance of the visitation of Divine justice for the sins of the world. This was not the sinful fear of dying: witness the words, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death! UNTO DEATH! 1 Here there were only three human witnesses—if indeed in all senses witnesses—and the record of the exceeding bitter Gethsemane cry might have been withheld, if the Evangelists had written with the fear of enemies before their eyes. As to the last impeachment, our Lord is the perfect Counterpart and Representative of the Old-Testament Jehovah. As He said, Ye believe in God, believe also in Me, 2 so we may say: those who disbelieve in Jesus because of His severity and wrath against hypocrites and reprobate sinners must disbelieve in the God of the ancient Scriptures. In the Gospels we see and hear and feel the very Jehovah of the older revelation, as He is described from Paradise to the Return from Captivity.

1 Matthew 26:38; 2 John 14:1.

HYPOTHESES AS TO JESUS AND CHRISTIANITY. As it respects the public appearance and work of the Founder of Christianity, the argument is turned against our Faith in many ways. It may be well to glance rapidly at the; stages through which the assault generally travels, or rather at the various restingplaces where the spirit of unbelief halts.

1. The first hypothesis reduces Jesus to the level of the other great reformers of mankind, assigning Him it may be the first place: PRIMUS INTER PARES, as they said of Him in Galilee that He was one of the prophets. 1 At the right juncture he arose and fascinated the world by a mysterious influence which it could not resist, and so swayed the minds of his followers that he became for ages the Lord of human thought and destiny. Every great power in human affairs has had its secret. Every man who has moved his own nation in his own time, and many nations afterwards, has had some peculiar element of success: a great doctrine, or the offer of something longed for by all men, or irresistible force of arms. So it is said that Jesus had his secret, though no one ventures to say what it was.

Suffice that he led captive the whole world at his will; and for some unexplained reason was more successful than any before him had ever been. The peculiarity of this hypothesis is that it treats the Founder of Christianity with great respect, and in fact has been accepted by many who accept the Christian revelation as from God: a Divine economy but without a Divine Head. But it is utterly inadequate to explain the Savior’s own testimony to the nature of His mission; and is therefore at best a great unreality. He Himself utterly disavowed it. From the beginning to the end of His public teaching He separated Himself from other human teachers as summarily as He separated Himself from other children of Adam. Although the words all that ever came before Me are thieves and

robbers 2 had another meaning as spoken to the Jews, they were intended also to signify that no Messiah professing to have come with a revelation for the race could substantiate his claims. He Who spoke was Himself from the beginning to the end of the world the only Revealer. Neither does Christ nor do His Apostles rest the weight of the Christian religion upon the human excellence of its Founder in comparison of other prophets of mankind.

1 Matthew 16:14; 2 John 10:8.

2. A second hypothesis makes Jesus a Jewish fanatic, who was inspired by an intense study of the ancient documents and legends of Judaism, formed during his silent youth the amazing scheme out of which Christianity sprang, kindled his own enthusiasm in the hearts of a few others whose natures he could read as he read Simon's, came to believe in himself as the creation of his own enthusiasm, cast all upon the hazard of a great experiment, and at length paid the penalty of his daring. But a single glance at the awful tranquility and reasonableness of the Lord's character at once dispels this illusion. An enthusiast He was, beyond any that ever lived: He was the second Adam, hungering and thirsting for what the first Adam had lost; both His anger and sorrow at the effect of sin, and His eagerness to redeem the world, sprang from His supreme charity. All the glorious enterprises of Christian love of souls have been only rills from the ocean in Him. But a fanatic He was not, nor is there one trace of fanaticism in all the narratives concerning Him. Those who read the Gospels in the light of the Old Testament, and with sufficient knowledge of Hebrew customs, will see no traces of religious frenzy in the acts of Jesus.

It was no more than a meet tribute to His own honor and the honor of His own Father that He cleansed the Temple: that is, the outer court and approaches of it, where alone the guilty traffic took place, and where such an act of zealotry as His would require only authority to sanction it: By what authority doest Thou these things? and who gave Thee this authority? 1 When He turned water into wine He did the precise opposite of what a fanatic would have essayed to do. When He seemed to renounce His mother and His brethren, it was only to teach that He was of no race or lineage, but the Son of man: that lesson taught, He never treated His mother or His kindred with anything but love. As to those who profess to believe that He was a conscious impostor, though they hear Him ask, How can Satan cast out Satan? 2 it is superfluous to say a word. That an impostor should spend his life in exposing hypocrisy, and in sacrificing self for the good of others, as Jesus confessedly did, His enemies of every age being witness, is what no sane reasoner ever alleged. Modern infidelity has outgrown that charge, and is or ought to be ashamed of having made it.

1 Matthew 21:23; 2 Mark 3:23.

3. So far we have been considering what arguments may be urged against the Divine origin of Christianity as represented by its Head. But these have had little success.

Accordingly, the attack has been more generally directed against the documents of the Faith: and elaborate theories have been devised to account for the Author of Christianity without any special reference to Himself or His own character. These are sometimes dignified by high-sounding names, and have had much more attention than they deserved. By whatever names known they are simply variations on the central theme that the Christian religion is a remarkable development under favoring circumstances of a fortunate germ. This germ could not, however, have developed

without the help of the early adherents of Jesus, who are supposed, in every form of the hypothesis, to have raised the superstructure—for the figure must now be changed—of the Christian system on the foundation of the name of Jesus: that name being supposed by some to have been merely the centre of legendary accretions, by others the symbol or expression of a national Messianic myth, and again by others as the watchword of opposite parties in the early church, in the interests of which the Gospels were invented, thus creating a Christendom that forgot the true meaning of the name Jesus, being the expression only of theories or tendencies.

(1.) First comes what may be called the Legendary Hypothesis of Christianity. It simply assigns to it an origin which requires no more than a slight nucleus of reality in the person of Jesus and His personal influence of word and work: the industrious enthusiasm of His followers invented all the rest. This method of accounting for the Christian economy is applied to it in common with the whole scheme of revelation and all the supernatural events and wonderful histories of the Bible. In fact, it is the normal and necessary argument of unbelief in the Divine conduct of the universe generally, and of human affairs in particular. It is based on a philosophy, falsely so called, which makes the religious sentiment merely an accident of human nature, either its embellishment or its disease as the case may be. It supposes that the universal instincts, traditions, and religious records of mankind are merely the produce of imagination under a special influence, for which no account can be given. In particular, it assumes that the entire fabric of the Bible is a tissue of the national legends of a people smitten more than most others with the religious phantasy. With the application of the notion of legend and invention to the Bible generally we have not now to do: save so far as its utter futility in the case of the Gospels discredits its value in regard to all revelation. As to the history of Jesus it is hard, inexpressibly hard, to believe that so compact, affecting, and heavenly a narrative could have been made up of the floating traditions of Galilee and Judea. It is enough to point to the inexpressible air of reality suffused over the accounts, their pure and childlike simplicity, the self-forgetful-ness of the writers, their impartiality in recording what showed the weakness as well as what showed the strength of the great Hero of their narrative, the transcendent Picture drawn so absolutely beyond invention, and the natural flow of the narrative into the current of later history which cannot be assigned to legend.

(2.) The Mythical Hypothesis is but a modification of the former: more seemingly dignified but not more rational. The myth may be defined as the vesture in which great national ideas have, from generation to generation, clothed themselves by a certain necessity of human development, and without the concurrence of any conscious legendary invention. Undoubtedly the myth, muthos, means the product of fancy but not the product of falsehood. Every race has had its great illusion. The hope of a coming deliverer has been bright in the expectation of every people, especially of every people whose history has been, like that of the Jews, calamitous. The Messiah had been for ages predicted and expected among them, especially since the Captivity. The Messianic idea was the great myth which was realized from time to time. When the Roman oppression was at the worst the idea took form in many persons; but that of Jesus was the fairest. He was only the resultant of many forces springing from the common expectation. His disciples made him the centre of their unconscious but necessary creations; and thus only embodied the supreme Judaic fiction. This hypothesis hardly merits refutation. It is utterly inconsistent with the facts. The Jesus of Christianity and the Christianity of Jesus did not spring up in poetry by which a nation expressed its hopes: the nation as such disavowed the whole. It was undeniably a very small company who

were responsible for the form of the new revelation. The hypothesis must be applied to the plain, straightforward, and earnest circle of the Apostles. On the one hand, it in some sense lowers them to the level of childish dreamers; on the other, it ascribes too much to their mythologic and creative faculty, which is thus supposed to have invented one of the most elaborate systems of belief known to man. The four Gospels and the Acts and the Epistles are not composed of the stuff that myths are made of. They are, or profess to be, clear history, and doctrine based upon the history; with reasoning of the severest kind binding the whole together. Legends and myths are after all impalpable things: Christ and Christianity are hard realities.

(3.) The most popular theory among philosophical opponents of Christianity in its perfect form makes it the result of conflict among various parties in the Christian Church.

Those who hold it may or may not accept the idea of a mission assigned by Providence to Christ: they may or may not believe in God. Generally they leave that matter undetermined. But there are two parties at two opposite extremes who have their specific notions as to the person of Jesus. The one hold Him to be the temporary expression of the eternal incarnation by which the Pantheistic God is for ever evolved in consciousness; the other hold Him to be the simple expression of a human ideal. But all agree that the system contained in the New Testament sprang up from a union of many opposite, or of two chief, tendencies: hence it is sometimes called the hypothesis of Tendency. It would be scarcely necessary to examine this were it not that it has been by far the most influential theory in the attempt to harmonize the various books of the New Testament. It assumes that Jesus lived and taught and died; but that no record of His history was thought of until far into the second century. Then arose gospels or memoirs with many aims or designs. Those which merely gratified an unsanctified curiosity found no permanent credit, and are now preserved only as relics. Some, however, were written in the interest of a Judaic Gospel, and of them St. Matthew takes the lead: some sentences preserved by him, and by him alone, might seem to make Jesus no more than a zealous assertor of the perpetuity of Judaism. Others were written in the interest of a Gospel for all the world, and of these St. Luke takes the lead: some of the most touching parts of his work introduce the heathen as receiving the glad tidings. Meanwhile, the hand of the partisan is to be found here and there and everywhere cunningly interpolating his own view: making the author whom he transcribes and whose text he corrupts speak a language inconsistent with his views. Accordingly, critics of this school have a reason to give for every various reading, and their only perfect text is that in which all writers absolutely agree. But there is another and more interesting application of the hypothesis, which might with more propriety be termed the PAULINE; for it really makes Paul the founder of the Christian system. Different schools contended both over the body and the spirit of Jesus: over His resurrection from the dead in the flesh, and the resurrection of the spirit of Judaism in Him: there was a broad distinction between the Jewish and the Gentile, the bond and the free, the Petrine Christianity and the Pauline. The writings of the New Testament were composed or at least finished, some with the one tendency, others with the other; but both were exquisitely combined in the Acts, which Peter and Paul divide between them with about equal pre-eminence. Paul, however, finally triumphed; his Jesus spoiled the best of the Rabbis or Prophets; prevented Judaism from putting on its perfection in the teaching of the Master on the Mount; and gave the character of Christ a coloring of his own that it has permanently retained. The careful study of the New-Testament writings refutes this most elaborate hypothesis, which arose from a superficial study of them. He who

collates the four Gospels will find that they agree with each other, and with the later Epistles in representing Christ to have abrogated the Law as an institution for one people, and to have fulfilled its meaning in every sense.

There is not a page of the New Testament where may not be found, either in letter or in spirit, the evangelization of the world. The simplicity of the history, both of the coincidence and of the divergence of Christianity and Judaism, forbids the acceptance of this notion that the idea of Jesus was perverted by Paul. The Pauline Christ does not differ from the Petrine or the Johannaean. It is St. Paul who calls Him a Minister of the circumcision; 1 and it is St. Peter who says that Christians are built up a spiritual house, 2 and it is St. John who, in the name of all the Apostles, announces: That which was from the beginning . . . declare we unto you. 3 All tendencies run one way, and that way is Christ: a Christ Who is not divided, but one. It is true that the Form of the Blessed One does not rise at once in full perfection upon the records of the New Testament: it is developed, as the word is, or gradually fashioned into its fullness and integrity. But the several writers conspire to this; and, after all that they have done, it is Christ Who remains and not they. Not I, each says, but Christ liveth in me. St. Paul especially deprecates this theory by anticipation in the beginning of the Corinthian Epistle. And, while we are observing the interminable phases through which it passes in this voluminous school of destructive critics, we hear always a voice: Was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul? 4 1 Romans 15:8; 2 1 Peter 2:5; 3 1 John 1:1; 1 John 1:3; 4 1 Corinthians 1:13.

SUMMARY.

1. Our Lord in delivering to His people the Faith delivers it, so to speak, with His own hand, and His own Person is His highest credential. He is the Author and Finisher of the Faith. 1 Prophets before Him and Apostles after Him look, and bid us look, only to Him; or, as the writer who strengthens the faith of the wavering Hebrews says, to Consider the Apostle and High Priest of our confession: 2 no man falters long whose eye is singly and supremely fixed on Christ Jesus. Revelation reflects the glory of His Person: that is, His Divine-human perfection. It is hard to demonstrate the truth of our Religion on the assumption that Christ was as other men; the Christianity of that postulate is not Christianity, and the character of Christ is the greatest possible embarrassment to its principles: the conclusion is too vast for its premises. No man ever paid the person and words of Jesus the tribute of sincere, unprejudiced, thoughtful attention without feeling the irresistible power of this argument. Every one that is of the truth heareth My voice: 3 these words are a sublime explanation and rebuke of the inmost spirit of infidelity. After all that He had said and done He would at the end give no further sign: Why askest thou Me? ask them which heard Me, what I have said unto them: behold, they know what I said.4 He still makes the same calm and unbending appeal: we have Moses and the prophets, we have Christ and the Apostles; but in them all He speaks of Whom the Father said, Hear ye Him! 5 There is the immortal strength of the credentials or evidences of Christianity. If we believe in Jesus, all other apologetics are comparatively needless: if we doubt about or reject Him, all other evidence will be comparatively superfluous. It is impossible to read deeply into the Gospels without perceiving that the Savior always appeals to something behind and below and beyond all other evidences. Whether present in the flesh or absent in heaven He looks for faith in Himself as a principle or sentiment or energy that ought to be awakened by His own manifestation and word. If that faith is not found a revelation from heaven is resisted: Ye will not come to Me, that ye might have life. 6 Wherever and

to whomsoever Jesus speaks there is an influence accompanying His words that must lead to faith, unless moral obstacles interfere. On that day when our Lord first opened to His disciples the secret of His Messiahship, and Simon Peter uttered the great confession, He pronounced the confessor blessed because he was taught of God; and yet it is most manifest that Simon only uttered the sentiment that the appeal of his Master naturally evoked. Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father Which is in heaven. 7 We mark that our Lord sometimes points to His miracles, sometimes to the fulfillment of prophecy in Himself; but sometimes He seems to disparage both these. The evidence that radiated from His own Person, the virtue to vanquish unbelief that flowed from Himself, He never disparaged.

Jesus is His own Interpreter, and His own Apologist: the Sun in the moral firmament that needs no other proof than that it is a pleasant thing to see the light. This great argument should be the helmet and breastplate of the Christian, especially of the Christian minister.

It gives immense corroboration to all other defenses; abates the strength of every form of opposition; and consummates and crowns the whole system of Christian apology. Other series of evidences may convince the judgment, but this central one gives rest to the heart. Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest, 8 was the language of our Lord at the time when He mourned over the unbelief of the wise and the prudent from whom His truth was hid, and offered His thanksgiving that to babes were revealed all things that were delivered unto Him of the Father.

1 Hebrews 12:2; 2 Hebrews 3:1; 3 John 18:37; 4 John 18:21; 5 Matthew 17:5; 6 John 5:40; 7 Matthew 16:17; 8 Matthew 11:28-30.

2. Doubtless, this appeal—which as a whole is unique in the Gospels—was not limited to those whose minds were troubled with perplexities as to the truth. But certainly they were included. We find the Savior often referring to the embarrassments of the age in which men’s thoughts were directed to the great Messianic expectation and they mused in themselves. Himself being the Christ, and knowing full well the thoughts of all hearts, He felt the most profound sympathy with the struggles of those who came to Him for the solution of their doubts. We may be sure that His promise of rest was given to such men as were feeling their way to Himself through a multitude of prejudices and difficulties which it is hard for us to estimate. We are apt to forget that He was not only the Friend of publicans and sinners, but the Friend of doubters also. The more carefully we examine the accounts of His intercourse with men, the more certainly we find that the difficulties in the way of their faith were always present to His thoughts. We plainly see and hear how solicitous He was to vanquish unbelief and win the hearts of all. But this great apostrophe to disquieted minds and the great promise of rest teaches us that He Himself has no argument more mighty and more influential than the study and emulation of His own character: That I am meek and lowly of heart. 1 1 Matthew 11:29.

THEINFLUENCEOF CHRISTIANITY.

Christianity in the world is its own permanent apology. Its credentials have been presented to mankind from the beginning in the slow but sure accomplishment of the Divine purpose which it proclaims. To this it made its appeal in Apostolic days, and to this it makes its appeal now: what religion should accomplish in the free spirit of man personal or individual and social or collective

the Christian religion has done and is doing. In one sense this is the most plain and palpable among the evidences of the Faith; in another sense it is one of the most difficult, inasmuch as the many obvious and reasonable objections which arise and demand to be considered are not always easily to be refuted. The best method of exhibiting this line of argument is, to state clearly what the claims of Christianity, as a power, are, and what they are not; then to point to the proof that it has answered and is answering its ends, notwithstanding the facts that may be urged to the contrary; and to show that every opposing or rival system has either been utterly powerless, or is slowly confessing its defeat.

THEAVOWEDAIM OF CHRISTIANITY. The key-note of this method of demonstrating the truth of Christianity is found in St. Paul's assurance that Christ in His Gospel is the power of God, and the wisdom of God.1After challenging the whole world to gainsay what he affirms, and reducing its glorying to naught by showing the impotence of its wisdom, he sums up: That no flesh should glory in His presence. But of Him are ye in Christ Jesus, Who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness and sanctification, and redemption: That, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord. 2 The chapter, ending thus, is really a chapter of Apologetics; and these words which close it place the Redeemer, as the Author of Christianity, in the midst: with the world at its best on one side, reduced to silence and hopelessness, while on the other, the believers in Jesus have their glorying restored in Him Whom the Father hath made the very author of their new life, Whom He hath set forth more particularly to be the sole fountain of wisdom for the teaching of mankind, of salvation from sin for individual man, and of redemption for the entire race.

1 1 Corinthians 1:24; 2 1 Corinthians 1:29-31.

1. The Gospel, making foolish the wisdom of this world, professes to impart perfect truth. The wisdom in St. Paul's sentence is what our Savior meant when He said, I am the Way, THE TRUTH, and the Life, 1 where the three testimonies must be united: in Jesus is the whole truth concerning the way of life; nor is there any other truth than as it is in Jesus. 2 Now it may be observed that the Gospel really limits truth to the things which concern man's relation to God: there may be many verities in other matters, but there is only one truth, and that is the foundation of religion. When therefore we estimate the nature of the claim of Christianity it must be remembered that the claim is limited to religious truth only, and that as taught of the Holy Ghost. If the documents of the Faith are challenged on innumerable other questions, and judged by their relation to all branches of human knowledge, and tested by their conformity or otherwise with universal science, then their Author says, by the mouth of the same Apostle: not the wisdom of this world.3 1 John 14:6; 2 Ephesians 4:21; 3 1 Corinthians 2:6.

2. Again, the system of Christianity proclaims that it brings to mankind generally, which of course in this matter is also man kind individually, deliverance from spiritual evil: that is, from the consequences of transgression by a provision for righteousness and from the consequences of separation from God by a provision for sanctification to Him and His service. These two, it will be observed, are very closely conjoined, so as to form one idea dikaiosúnee te kaí hagiasmós. 1 This is the wonderful claim of the religion of Christ, that it professes to put away sin, by a method that at once sets the conscience right with God and His holy law, and delivers the consciousness of man from the sense of impurity and consequent estrangement from Him: both the CONSCIENCE and the CONSCIOUSNESS of sin being in the design of grace removed. The provision for this is the

grand secret of the Gospel and the design of the mystery of the Incarnation. God hath provided in His incarnate Son the means of putting away human evil. Jesus Christ is at once man and God: His mediation on behalf of the human race is that of One in Whom God meets man on a new ground and in a new relation. In Christ all sin is atoned for by man: for He is man absolutely. In Christ God accepts the Atonement, and unites man to Himself notwithstanding his sin: satisfaction being presented to justice, and satisfaction guaranteed to holiness that the pardoned sin shall be also abolished. But here again it must be remembered that Christianity does not promise to rid individuals of evil by virtue of an act external. There must be a personal union with Jesus by faith, even as there is already a collective union of the whole race without faith. The individual is delivered only on certain conditions: through the penitent acceptance of the Atonement, and a sanctifying Spirit provided for all but administered only to the soul united with the Lord.

If the infidel spirit asks how sin should reign in spite of an atonement that has put away sin, the answer is twofold: first, evil does not absolutely reign in the world, as will be hereafter shown; and, secondly, the claim of the Gospel is not to deliver every man by a physical necessity or despotic application of power, but everyone who uses its provisions as an infallible remedy abundantly supplied.

1 1 Corinthians 1:30.

3. The religion of Jesus professes to redeem the world of mankind or the race of Adam from all its evil: to be set for the healing of the nations. 1 This is everywhere its unlimited promise. It is not to be denied that redemption from all kinds of calamity is announced: a redemption in which not only man rejoices, but, in a certain sense, the whole creation around rejoices with him. The Old Testament bids the earth and the heavens be glad because of the coming of the Universal Deliverer; 2 and when He came Whom the earth and the nations desired it was declared of Him by Himself, in the first words He uttered concerning His mission when He assumed His office in Nazareth: He hath anointed Me to preach the Gospel to the poor; He hath sent Me [to heal the brokenhearted], to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. 3 But here again we must be careful to note that the Savior of our race never professes to have come with an absolute, unconditional, and universal deliverance from all the effects of transgression. How this should be, why it should be, that the Redeemer of the world does not, notwithstanding His name, put an end for ever to the evil of the world, is a question to which no answer can be given: no other answer, that is, than that the redemption of mankind is a probationary redemption, and takes effect only through the spread of a spiritual kingdom, as a process that acts with moral, slow, and not in every respect irresistible, force.

1 Revelation 22:2; 2 Isaiah 2:1-22; Psalms 96:1-13; Psalms 100:1-5; 3 Luke 4:18.

4. Such are the claims, and with such qualifications, for which alone the religion of Jesus is answerable. In an argument which pleads its effects and results we are bound to take Christianity according to its own profession. It does not claim to be an instrument in the hand of absolute omnipotence: providing a heavenly Man or a Divinity in man who should first instruct the race in duty, then go down to the pit where its past generations were gathered, and rescue them; then send forth His influence to abolish sin, either in this world by moral teaching or in the next by purgatorial discipline; and, finally, put an end to all the evil that could not otherwise be removed.

Neither is that the Gospel which Christ preaches, nor could we well apologize for it if it were. Be that as it may, the Christianity which it is our business to defend by showing its own credentials is of a very different character. It professes to be the sole instructor of mankind: but only in religious truth, and only through a word which a Divine Interpreter must explain. It promises to save men from their sins: but only through such an atoning provision on behalf of all as each must appropriate for himself. It engages to emancipate our world from all its evils; but only as that world is created anew in Christ, and made up of individuals who receive His salvation. If the opponents of Christianity forget the freedom of man's will, and the moral character of the influence religion brings to bear upon it, then they contend against a religion which we are not anxious to defend.

CHRISTIANITY HASFULFILLEDITS MISSION.

It may be confidently asserted that the Christian Faith has made good its glorying, whether we look generally at its influence in the world, or at its specific triumphs under the several heads already adverted to as the substance of Apostolical apology. THE DIVINE WISDOM IN THE GOSPEL. That Christianity has introduced into the world a system of doctrine worthy to be called Divine is the plea itself sets up, and one that may be sustained: in fact, it alone has a system of doctrine. All must admit that its exhibition of truth is at least the most compact and perfect the world has ever known: this must be allowed even by those who demur to many of its individual dogmas. Remembering that the Christian Religion means both its Testaments, that which it received and that which it created, we may say that it presents a body of professedly authoritative teaching on all subjects of interest to mankind, — ranging from heaven to earth, from earth to things under the earth, and thence back to heaven again, —in comparison of which all other teaching that belongs to the race is but as legend and fable. It is no exaggeration to affirm that whatever great fundamental truths are found in other systems come in a nobler form and in a more consistent connection from the lips of Jesus and His Apostles. There are doubtless many great spiritual ideas held by the Eastern Religions especially in common with the Gospel. But in the Gospel they are released from those appendages which almost distort them out of recognition; and, what is more than that, they are taught as parts of one vast and literally infinite circle of truth the centre of which is God. Although the outermost circumference of this circle is nowhere, its inner circumference, which comprehends strictly human doctrines, is clearly defined and traceable all round, without any arc of indistinctness. It is the compactness, completeness, and consistency of the Evangelical system of truth that sustains its claim to be the wisdom of God. But the argument—so far as it is argument—will be better exhibited by considering what may be said in opposition.

1. It would hardly be a fair objection to the Christian system of teaching that it is, as a whole, beyond the grasp of the human intelligence. Man's faculties are limited, and cannot expect to understand all the mysteries of religion. We know that we are encompassed about with innumerable worlds, which are but parts of the universe; but beyond our own planet we know little even of physical nature: how can we expect to understand the things that pertain to spirit and the God of spirits? Whatever truth is, it must at all points transcend our capacity. But it may be urged that many of the doctrines of Christianity are inconsistent with reason, or opposed to its primary laws of thinking: indeed, this is even charged against all the fundamental and peculiarly Christian revelations of truth. The Holy Trinity, that in the necessary unity or soleness of the Divine essence there are three Personal Subsistences; the creation of the physical universe and the beginning of limited existence; the probation and fall of spirits for ever unsaved and of redeemed mankind, as

involving the dependence of an Infinite Being on contingent events; the Incarnation of the Eternal Son of God, one Person in two natures as distinct as Infinite and finite can be; and the vicarious sacrifice of that Divine-human Person for the race of man; the vast contrast between this insignificant world and the price of its redemption; the doctrine of original sin as infecting the race, and yet virtually atoned for .at the beginning or before it began its course, as actually after many ages expiated at the cross, and nevertheless eternally punished in many:—these are but specimens of 'doctrine absolutely essential to the Christian system which are said to militate against the first principles of human thought. Similarly, the entire record of the providential government of the world with which these doctrines are bound up, especially some of the more wonderful facts of Scripture, such as the series of stern Divine interventions and judgments in the old world and the prophecies in the New Testament of yet sterner to come, excite the rebellion of human thought, which measures the unknown God by a standard of its own. Against this class of objections to Christianity there is no other argument than that which Christianity itself uses in the Scriptures of the New Testament. Both the Master and His Apostles speak as perfectly aware that they announce things utterly beyond human comprehension and things which seem to contradict reason. Their reply to every objection is, that the whole system of Divine truth is beyond and above mere human criticism; in fact requiring a special faculty, and that faculty to be specially illumined from above. Here was the force of our Lord's appeal to Nicodemus, who was perplexed by one of the seeming paradoxes of the new religion: If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things. 1 This is a word of great importance: our Lord's figure suggests that He had mysteries to disclose, not so much Himself as by His Apostles, which were as far above ordinary doctrine hitherto familiar as heaven is above earth. The Apostle Paul also again and again speaks of the wisdom of God in a mystery: 2 in mystery unsearchable. The apologist may and must attempt to conciliate human reason by showing that the most difficult doctrines introduced by Christianity are rather above man's thinking power than contrary to the laws of thought; that some faint adumbrations of the highest of them all, the Holy Trinity, are found in nature and in the human constitution and some gropings after it in most of the traditions of nations. He may also point to the perfect unity of the system which stands or falls with its-awful doctrine of sin: a doctrine confirmed by all the facts of human experience and the instincts of the human consciousness. If so much stress is laid upon the invasion and suppression of our instinctive principles, then it is lawful to point to them when they are in favor of Christian doctrine. Undoubtedly the tenor of the teaching concerning sin is in harmony with the profoundest thoughts of the human heart.

He may also appeal to the instinctive hope of an equalizing and reconciling hereafter and that future solution which is reserved for the vindication of the ways of Providence. But, after all that may be said, those who defend the Faith must be content to use an argument which man in his irrational pride despises: the argument that imitates the Bible and refuses to argue with one who will not accept more than he can understand. Christianity imposes a doctrinal as well as an ethical cross. In many cases, the burden of the Faith is the chief ethical cross: that of which our Lord said, speaking of the mysteries committed unto Himself for babes: Take My yoke upon you and learn of Me! 3 His elect ones in every age have bowed down; and, though this is not itself an argument, it must be remembered that very many of the greatest intellects among men have thought it wisdom to bear that cross, and have found in bearing it their rest. This rest must be sought and found.

1 John 3:12; 2 1 Corinthians 2:7; 3 Matthew 11:29.

2. The history of heresy in Christendom, the manifold perversions of doctrine within the Church, and the endless diversities of opinion among believers themselves, are pleas of which much use has been made. It cannot be denied that every truth has been perverted, and that almost every truth has been denied, among the communities professing to hold the Head; and, more-over, that the same documents have been and are still made the standard of appeal by maintainers of very opposite opinions on some most important points. But this undoubted fact is, on the whole, rather in favor of the Christian system than to its prejudice. Religious truth is not like truth mathematical. It is probationary, and does not command assent. Had it been otherwise it might have banished every error from the world in the course of one age. But it has the entire strength of sin and sinful prejudice against it; and those whose lives it cannot reform would fain reform its teaching. The Wisdom of God in the Gospel has ever waged, according to its own prediction, a double conflict: against errors in the world without, and against the foes of its own household. To obviate the argument that might and would be found in the unfaithfulness of the professors of His religion, our Lord has left on record His own testimony that many false prophets shall rise and shall deceive many. 1 So also St. Paul predicted the greater and lesser apostasies, and that evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived. 2 And St. John summed up the strain: declaring that prophecy had already become fact: Even now are there many Anti-christs. 3 Moreover, he turns the existence and abounding of these opponents of Christ and His doctrine into an argument in favor of the religion from which they declined. Meanwhile the heresies pass away, but the truth endureth for ever.4 1 Matthew 24:11; 2 2 Timothy 3:13; 3 1 John 2:18-19; 4 1 Peter 1:25. THE RELIGIOUS POWER OF PERSONAL CHRISTIANITY. The effects of Christianity upon the character of him who heartily embraces it, and yields to its personal discipline, most abundantly confirm its claim to be a religion provided by God for man. It offers, through the atoning mediation of Christ accepted by faith, a perfect deliverance from the sense of guilt, and a perfect system of education for holiness.

These are the elements of a salvation needed, and equally needed, by all mankind: the universal cravings of the race have been known to seek them as long as the history of man has been known. On these two great necessities hang all the obligations of religion.

It must meet these, or it is useless: and. if it truly meets these, then it leaves nothing wanting. New Christianity in all its doctrinal and ethical teaching keeps those two supreme demands in view. It makes everything, as it were, subordinate to them. It professes to show every man living the Way of Peace and the Way of Holiness: the method by which he may obtain knowledge of the remission of his sins, and full deliverance from the sinfulness of his nature. It promises to every believer a conscious union with his God: the power of a Divine life within making him happy and holy and fit for fellowship with the company of heaven. The testimonies of Scripture on these subjects are confirmed by a cloud of innumerable witnesses in the history of mankind, beginning with the Biblical records and continued to this day. Against this evidence of the truth of Christianity as against every other many things may be urged.

1. It may be said that this kind of argument is altogether subjective, and begs the question. That the Christian religion makes such a claim is evident, and also that many have supposed themselves to be living witnesses of its truth; but that all such sup posed experience is or may be

the result of delusion, or of imagination, or of strong faith in an idea which goes far towards accomplishing its own will. Now the effects produced by the Gospel in those who have entirely surrendered themselves to its sway have been such as no imagination could produce. Multitudes have felt relief from the burden of a guilty conscience, either gradually or suddenly imparted, which has been to them as if, in the language of Jesus, they had passed from death unto life; 1 and they have consciously known, as they have been taught by St. Paul, the power of God unto salvation. 2 They have been persuaded — as they think by the Holy Ghost — that their sins were blotted out; and they have felt a strength supernatural in doing right, in bearing affliction, in vanquishing self, and in suffering for God, the source of which they have confidently ascribed to the same Spirit. But this kind of evidence the New Testament itself is not eager to press on the unbeliever. It is reserved for the sure encouragement of those who receive it.

1 1 John 3:14; 2 Romans 1:16.

2. It may be said further that the average lives of professors of the Faith from the beginning have not sustained this argument: that the Gospel failed when it was first sent, accompanied by miraculous aids; that it then elevated only a very select number; and that its spiritual transformations and triumphs have been comparatively few from the very first, so few that they are fitly named the elect. Here again the apologist has little to say.

He must admit that our religion has waged war against a strong power in human nature, and that this has been often a wavering or a failing war, even among its best professors. But if we grant that the influence of Christianity is moral only and not physical, there is no argument as against its own Divinity in its comparative failure. The earliest prophecies in the New Testament predicted precisely what has taken place; while they also assure us that the triumph of the Gospel shall prove hereafter to have been exceedingly great: much greater indeed in every age than the eye of man could discern.

3. But the plea most earnestly urged against this argument is this, that the best effects of Christianity have been produced by other systems either independent of it or contrary to it. Almost all the so-called natural religions of older or of more recent times have names to present which are thought not to suffer in comparison with the saints of Christendom. The Eastern faiths have a wonderful catalogue both of ascetic and of mystic devotees; and the Greek and Roman philosophies, — which have gloried in such men as Socrates, Seneca, Marcus Antoninus, —are not behind them. This is a plea that it is not hard to set aside, although the method of doing so may seem somewhat bigoted. First, no true advocates of our Faith deny that godliness has existed outside of direct revelation. The early apologists of the Faith were wont to dwell much upon what they called the LOGOS SPERMATICUS, or the pre-incarnate Son of God at the root of human nature, or as a seminal inspiration of-truth among the heathen, or the influence of the light of THE WORD 1 everywhere diffused among men, as the New Testament declares. The effort to find Him after Whom the Gentiles groped has produced some of the noblest fruits of the tree of human morality. Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold, 2 our Lord Himself said; and we may suppose Him to have wondered at the faith of many, before and besides the Syrophoenician and the Centurion, who put to shame the children of revelation. But this plea is sometimes carried too far. It may be denied that, apart from Christianity, any mortal has ever rejoiced in forgiveness and perfect victory over sin. On the contrary, the highest ethics taught and exemplified in heathenism

have lacked the very qualities and prerogatives on which Christian teaching lays the utmost stress. Not only have they lacked these qualities, but they have despaired of the possibility of reaching them. The Heathen atonements were never regarded by those who offered them as securing forgiveness from heaven; and Heathen philosophy never pretended to bring to more than a few, and to them only in a limited degree, the thorough purification of the nature.

1 John 1:9; 2 John 10:16.

4. Finally, it is said, as already intimated, that this is an argument in a circle. We assume that Christianity is true because it produces certain effects which itself only declares to be Divine. Nor can we altogether disavow this. The evidences of the Faith are of necessity deeply infected with the Petitio Principii. From beginning to end the New Testament refers to the effects of its own proclamation of the Gospel as being produced by God. It accustoms the individual believer—and to the individual reference is now made—to look for and to be content with the testimony of the Divine Spirit, concerning Whom and His influence it asserts, He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself. 1 If it be asked, how is he to know that secret influence to be the Holy Ghost? the answer is, that the Holy Ghost also says, IT is I! 2 And, after all, the final refuge of the humble Christian must be in the Divine authentication of the Faith within himself.

1 1 John 5:10; 2 Matthew 14:27.

CHRISTIANITY RENOVATING THE WORLD. The world is under a manifest process of deliverance from all the evils that weigh upon it as the fruit of sin. The pledge j given by our Lord in that first sermon at Nazareth has so far been redeemed that we may with confidence predict that it will be redeemed in full. 1 No power at all comparable to Christianity has ever been at work in the world: indeed, no power save the Gospel can be said ever to have been at work at all in the world of humanity at large. Judaism was Christianity within a limited sphere, and with only the hope of the Christ Who has come. But from the day of Pentecost the Faith of Jesus has been leavening the entire race of mankind. Negatively, it has been steadily raising the tone of universal morality, and abolishing the worst evils of human society: even beyond the limits of its own fellowship it has been an influence for good wherever it has been found, It has waged exterminating warfare against every vice that has ever been condemned by man’s instinct or laws: mitigating on the way the evils that it is bent on destroying though unable at once to destroy. It may be boldly affirmed that wherever genuine Christianity has been admitted it has discountenanced and weakened and in due time abolished every practice that corrupts the fellowship of mankind as such. Positively, it has introduced benevolence in a thousand forms unknown to antiquity, and charities hitherto without a name; it has raised and dignified all the nations that have received it; and it may fairly claim as its own the civilization of the modern world. Objections here also only too readily rise: objections confessedly hard to deal with.

1 Luke 4:21-27.

1. It is, alas, a too obvious plea that the organization of Christianity itself has been to a very great extent flagrantly corrupt. Very soon—to put the counterplea in its worst aspect—the religion of Christ, or rather the outward form of it in the world, fell under temptation. Errors crept in which were all the more perilous, and all the more humiliating, because they sprang from corruption of the noblest principles of the faith. It is not necessary to enumerate, what it is impossible to deny,

that the Church which should reform the world seemed unable to keep herself pure. This plea cannot be answered without humiliation that it should be so, and thankfulness for the confidence we have that the foundation of God standeth sure. 1 As to the answer itself it is simple enough. As it is no valid argument against individual religion that the godly may fall, so it is no disparagement of Christianity as a system that it is liable to perversion. The causes of that perversion are very obvious; the body corporate was not protected against them by any defense that should interfere with the laws of historical development; and both our Lord and His Apostles foretold the very apostasies and declensions that took place. Moreover, the evils and corruptions which have encumbered the cause of Christ have never altogether suppressed its saving influence in the world. And, finally, a steady reformation has long been going on within the Church which will issue, according to prophecy, in making it a yet more effectual power for the conversion of the nations.

1 2 Timothy 2:19.

2. But a still more serious difficulty here arises. It is urged, and has been urged in all ages, that the supposed remedial economy of the Gospel is either, on the one hand, arbitrarily under the sovereign and elective control of God, or, on the other, dependent on the free agency of man: in either case, too slow and partial to be a real and effectual relief of the miseries of mankind as such. Perhaps no objection to the Christian scheme has weighed more with thoughtful minds than this. It seems hard that a Divine scheme for the rescue of a world should in any sense suffer defeat, or be slow in its processes and partial in its operation. Of mere human systems this might be expected; but surely not of the system which is said to declare both the wisdom and the power of God. The facts themselves are to the most cursory consideration very embarrassing. The countless multitudes of the descendants of Adam have been only slightly touched by the Gospel: comparatively few have even seen the tree whose leaves are for the healing of the nations, and still fewer have put forth their hands to it. What can be said to these things? Scarcely anything but what the Scripture itself says on this very subject. The delay of Christianity to accomplish its mission, while the dying generations of men wait for it, is indeed a mystery unfathomable; but it is no argument against the Christian Faith to those who remember that it is one branch of an infinite scheme, every department of which is oppressed or glorified by the same mystery. And those who believe that the Creator works by a law of evolution that required numberless ages for the preparation of the earth, and in a long series of developments before man was reached, ought not to rebel against the slow process of man’s redemption. There is no reply but the appeal to the unfathomable mystery that surrounds our being on every conceivable hypothesis. Those who reject Christianity because it does not search to the bottom and expound the enigma of life are not wise: it at least goes immeasurably farther than any other philosophy. We cannot with our present faculties, or at any rate with our faculties in their present stage of discipline, reconcile the inscrutable counsel of God, on the one hand, and the profound abyss, on the other, of human control over human destiny. Meanwhile the Christian economy is most certainly accomplishing the redemption of the human family; there is no other force in the world that even aims at this. We may predict that it will make an end of sins, and bring in everlasting righteousness for the race as such. We may be sure that the time will come when all miseries and evils that grace can vanquish will be vanquished and be forgotten; and that the wisdom of God will hereafter give account of everything that seems to impeach His goodness. As to the multitudes of individuals whom the Gospel seems to forget or fail to save by the way, they must be left with God and His Christ. Shall not the Judge

of all the earth do right? 1 But this eternal Judge of all the earth in the counsel of redemption committed all judgment unto the Son; 2 and He hath given Him authority to execute judgment also, because He is the Son ofMan 1:3 1 Genesis 18:25; 2 John 5:22; 3 John 5:27.

THEPERSISTENCEAND PERMANENCE OF CHRISTIANITY.

Christianity has sustained its other credentials, and added a new one, in the fact of its early spread, its enduring life, and its outliving every form of opposition. Its triumph over all the assaults of its foes as well as all the contingencies of time was predicted by our Lord for the encouragement of His disciples, when He first announced the foundation and destiny of His Church. The earliest use of the term is very suggestive in this light: Upon this rock I will build My church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. 1 It is both His defiance and His prophecy.

1 Matthew 16:18.

THEEARLYSPREAD OF THE FAITH. The history of the early victories of Christianity is a strong enforcement of its claims. As a religion it had everything against it: so decisively against it that, on the supposition of its being one more new cults introduced by a human innovator, or, as St. Paul says, but a man's covenant, 1 every method of accounting for its swift diffusion and sway is baffled.

Nothing in its relation to Judaism was favorable: the new Gospel was a miserable disappointment to the Jewish people: its proclamation of a crucified Messiah was unto the Jews a stumbling block. 2 It had few elements of affinity with the philosophical systems of mankind, and made no appeal to the pride of the human intellect: it preached a fundamental doctrine that was unto the Greeks foolishness, and even that doctrine it preached foolishly. It did not, in fact, come with any formal doctrine at all; but simply enforced at first the old truths of natural religion as taught by a new Teacher Who must be accepted before His mysteries were unfolded. It is true that the Person presented was supreme in excellence; but the Gentile disputers did not know this at first, and all they knew was that he suffered a death of infamy. If he was accepted it must be as one who in defiance of every law of nature had left his tomb, but did not, as might be expected, come back to live among men. Moreover, the men who proclaimed the Gospel could not be acceptable to the Jews, not being Rabbis; nor to the Greeks, not being philosophers; nor to the common people generally, not bringing a popular doctrine. Their Gospel inculcated ethics of the grandest character; but such virtues as spiritual-mindedness, unlimited forgiveness, meekness, self-sacrifice, contempt for this world, abjuration of all good in man, were not likely to win attention. It introduced its adherents to a society that had no attraction but its simplicity, no rewards but persecution in this life. Yet in a few decades it shook the world, and in a few centuries subjugated it.

1 Galatians 3:15; 2 1 Corinthians 1:23.

1. Against this it is urged that the power of a great idea fitly represented has, in every age, swayed mightily the minds of men, and that Christianity was only one more instance and not really more influential than some others. Something in the state of the world predisposed it for the peculiar idea of redemption introduced by Jesus and His Apostles; nor is it necessary—the argument runs—that we should know the peculiar secret. But it may be absolutely denied that any system of

religious thought has ever commanded all kinds of people and excited such a perfect devotion. Brahmanism and Buddhism and the other Eastern religions never even pretended to be forces for the world; and though they have long existed they are tending towards extinction, and the Nirvana of one of them is written on all. Mohammedanism has lived by the truth it borrowed from the Bible, and been spread only by secular force: it has indeed ruled a large portion of the globe; but it has long ago lost its missionary character. Christianity in all respects stands alone. Of course, there is no demonstrative force in the mere argument of success; nor would there be, if success had been much greater. But at least it may be said that in connection with other pleas this has great force: apart from a Divine power, there is no mystery in the religion of the Christ greater than its early triumphs.

2. But, although there was much external might to oppose the spread of Christianity, it has been argued that there was much within it naturally to further its diffusion. A subtle case has been made out of the concurrence of fortunate circumstances: such as the pure and vehement zeal of the Christians, their new doctrine of a future life, the miraculous powers attributed to them, their austere morals, the union and discipline and vigor of the commonwealth. But it is obvious that this style of argument does in reality pay a high tribute to the new Faith, while it has little force as a human explanation of its triumphs. The reasoning unconsciously points to that very Finger of God which it aims to withdraw from human affairs, if not to abolish altogether. THE CONFLICT WITHJUDAISM.

1. Judaism was the first enemy that Christianity encountered, and has been in all ages the most virulent if not the most formidable. Its opposition had this peculiarity, that it was manifested against the Founder of the Faith: in fact, it was the only human and visible opponent that He met upon earth. He came unto His own and His own received Him not. 1 Throughout the whole course of His ministry, but especially towards its close when His claim to be the Messiah became known, He was persecuted by the representatives of Judaism. This gave a peculiar emphasis to His saying: A man’s foes shall be they of his own household. 2 Jesus arose in the midst of our race as a member of the Jewish household, to perfect and glorify the ancient religion. His brethren according to the flesh by their malice and blindness brought about in a way they never contemplated the consummation and end of their own national religion and law. And the result of their enmity in the death of the Messiah was a most wonderful fulfillment of prophecy and evidence of the truth of His claims. When we enter the Acts, we find that the first contest of the Gospel was everywhere with the Jews; and that in most places, though not in all, the cause of Jesus was triumphant. It was not in Jerusalem alone that a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith. 3 But neither in the Gospels nor in the Acts is the triumph of Christianity over Judaism so described as to make it an argument of the Divinity of the Christian religion. Rather it might seem as if the persistent enmity of the Jews was made such an argument, being so directly a fulfillment of prediction: Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet: unto our fathers, saying, Go unto this people, and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive.4 1 John 1:11; 2 Matthew 10:36; 3 Acts 6:7; 4 Acts 28:25-28.

2. During the early ages there was a fierce polemic kept up between the Christians and the Jews. At first it seemed as if a compromise would be affected. A considerable body of Jewish converts received Jesus as the Messiah, but only as the greatest of the prophets, and as raised up for the ancient people: others being admitted to these privileges only by complying with their rite of

initiation, and by binding themselves to keep the law. But when that expedient failed, and the Christianity which had its final expression in St. Paul's writings gained the ascendancy, it was bitterly opposed by the ancient people, and all the more bitterly because they ascribed to Jesus and His religion the ruin of their polity. But Judaism the mother declined, and Christianity the daughter triumphed. From generation to generation there has been a ceaseless enmity between the Israel after the flesh and the true Christian Israel after the Spirit; but, applying any fitting test whatever, we must be persuaded that the Christian Messiah has gotten to Himself the victory. His renewed, enlarged, baptized, and perfected Judaism lives on earth: the Judaism which still clings to the law, and still looks for Another, lives indeed, but is dead while it lives.

It has had its schools of learning, and names of high excellence. It has also displayed marvelous virtue in its charities, in its indestructible patience of hope—though a hope that must make ashamed—and in its meek endurance of unexampled wrongs, often from Christian hands. But it is, as a system, dead, twice dead; and never can be revived.

Moreover, it is remarkable that the greatest intellects produced by modern Judaism— Maimonides and Spinoza, the latter especially, —have done much to unsettle the religious ideas of mankind.

3. But the affecting and unnatural conflict between Christianity and Judaism is itself, and apart from any great success, a strong argument in favor of the Christian cause. Both systems are world-wide in their extent; both pervade, or bid fair to pervade, the whole earth; but how entirely different are the issues of their progress respectively! The one is advancing on a career of beneficence, in the course of which it sweeps away all systems of idolatry, cruelty, and wrong. The other simply overspreads the earth without any mission or pretence of a mission: in obedience, as it were, to some fate or absolute compulsion. Why the Jews are diffused among the nations, more or less dishonored of all, and in spite of the enlightened views of the present day never able to throw off the universal ban that is upon them, is a mystery that can be solved only by their own Scriptures, now become not theirs but ours. In them, as interpreted by the New Testament, the reason is given so plainly that he may run who readeth it. It goes back to their very origin: The Lord shall scatter you among the nations. 1 And a second date it has, which is the turning point of the history of mankind: His blood be on us, and on our children. 2 Moses predicted that, if they should do evil in the sight of the Lord, 3 they should cease from the enjoyment of their inheritance: Ye shall soon utterly perish from off the land whereunto ye go over Jordan to possess it; ye shall not prolong your days upon it, but shall utterly be destroyed. 4 Utter destruction is never in the Divine threatenings annihilation. His ancient people have gone out of the presence of God, like Cain; and a mark has been set upon them, that they should not be exterminated, but remain as an enduring demonstration of the truth of their rejected Messiah, Whose cutting off—BUT NOT FOR HIMSELF—was their greatest EVIL IN THE SIGHT OF THE LORD.5 1 Deuteronomy 4:27; 2 Matthew 27:25; 3 Deuteronomy 4:25; 4 Deuteronomy 4:26; 5 Daniel 9:26 . THE CONFLICT WITHHEATHENISM.

1. When Christianity appeared, the Gentile religions were both at their best and at their worst: they had reached the highest result of their wisdom and art; but they had also descended to the lowest point of their moral impotence. The world was never so highly cultivated, and never so ethically vile. But both the strength and the weakness of heathenism were armed against the new faith, which was the object of the converging attacks of all the forces of the Gentile world. Christianity

during the first three centuries was of course aggressive as well as persecuted. The ten imperial persecutions were only a reaction of heathenism against a spiritual persecution which itself had to endure from a religion that spared none of its weaknesses and poured contempt on all its errors. That religion prospered in spite of every attack; and drove the mightiest mythology the world had known into the villages, whence it derived the name of PAGANISM. That which had been branded as an Exitiabilis Superstitio compelled before the fourth century the homage of all civilized nations of the empire. An attempt was made to revive heathenism under Julian the Apostate; but it signally failed. The great Apologies of the second century were never answered. And when, somewhat later, the advocates of the ancient and effete religions charged upon Christianity the decay and ruin of the empire, Augustine's treatise De Civitate and other similar writings, silenced the argument of heathenism for ever. Although many extraneous causes conspired to aid the Christian Religion in gaining ascendancy, the dispassionate verdict of history must be that its own internal power gave it the victory. And that power was the Holy Ghost leading it in triumph in Christ.1 1 2 Corinthians 2:14.

2. This triumph of Christianity is all the more remarkable because as conquering it was itself infected by many of the errors it displaced. Scarcely a form of superstition was overcome which did not contribute its measure of corruption to the faith of Jesus. The earlier and later heresies were to a great extent results of the infusion of the old leaven of Oriental and Classical modes of thought. Gentile philosophy was vanquished; but its Parthian arrows left their poison, and the final superiority of orthodox Christianity over the subtle errors of Gnosticism, Manichssism, Pantheistic mysticism, with the superstitions of materialistic sacramentalism in later days, manifested its eternal power not less than its original suppression of heathen error. If we take a broad and catholic view of Christian history in its doctrinal development we shall see that there has been a steady, continuous victory of truth over all forms of the Gentile lie whether without or within the Church. No weapon formed against it, however often reappearing, has finally prospered.

3. No species of heathenism has ever effectually withstood the power of the Christian religion. Not always has its mode of assault been in harmony with its own precepts.

Too often has its war with the old idolatries and superstitions been in harmony with that spirit which the Lord condemned in His sons of thunder. 1,2 Sometimes it has imitated the violent methods of Mohammedanism or employed the cunning wiles of the great deceiver. But there has never been wanting an honest and true propagandism. And the result has always accorded with the high aim and pretension of the Gospel. It has supplanted one system after another in the South, and the West, and the North. The Eastern superstitions alone have seemed to defy its power, But these are slowly and surely yielding. They are the most ancient forces of heathenism, and in seemingly immovable tranquility have survived the fall of a multitude of other systems; but they are surely succumbing to the truth which was earlier than they, and are fulfilling the predictions which make certain the universal spread of the Gospel. In them the word shall have its double truth: many that are first shall be last in yielding; and the last shall be first 3 in demonstration of the glory of our Lord.

1 Luke 9:55; 2 Mark 3:17; 3 Matthew 19:30.

4. On the whole, a calm survey of the state of the world under the influence of the Christian religion will lead every philosophic student of history to the conclusion that the Head of the Church will

surely become the Master of the whole earth. Human prophecy, guided by the lights of the past and the analogy of the present, must concur with prophecy Divine in predicting this. In the struggle for existence—if we condescend to use current phraseology —the survival will be on the side of Christianity. Give it time enough and it will, even apart from supreme interpositions of the Spirit, displace every other system. It has annihilated many; it has transformed some; it has touched all with the earnest of a fundamental change. The mystery of its slow development is in some respects unfathomable. But its ultimate supremacy is to human calculation the highest possible probability: to faith in the word of revelation it is as certain as the being of God. And its past, present, and future triumph is its irresistible credential. THE CONFLICT WITHNATURAL RELIGIONS.

1. It has been already seen that the teaching of Christ is as much a republication of the original principles of natural religion as it is an expansion of the religion of Judaism. It rests upon these two as its pillars, so far as it is a religion: that is, a system of observances and morality and worship, which is all that religion or threeskeías, means. Christianity is, however, a great revelation, an unveiling, of the supernatural world or order of things; and against all that it brings over and above the teaching of nature there has been from the beginning a protest. In fact, the early Apologies abound with arguments vindicating the religion of Jesus against those who asserted the sufficiency of the light of nature. But the victory over opponents of this class was then easy, as the world had been long accustomed to the thought of heavenly interventions. Antiquity, which really had nothing but the traditions of a lost revelation, or what is called natural religion, was never without a strong conviction that it had at the same time something much better. It would hardly have understood the force of any argument against a revelation as such.

2. Perhaps the first, certainly the most influential, development of opposition to Christianity proceeding on this line of thought was DEISM, the form assumed by English Infidelity in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In this continuous assault on the Faith many elements combined: it was an application to theology, never intended by Bacon, of the new philosophy of induction and experience, as also an application of the sensational philosophy never intended by Locke; but it was mainly an attempt to show that the principles of natural religion render a supernatural revelation superfluous, that the documents and evidences of the supposed supernatural revelation are contradictory to the light of nature, and also that these documents are in them-selves unworthy of confidence. As it regards this last point, in which the English Deists were followed by the destructive critics of France and Germany, more must be said when the documents are under consideration. The Nationalism also that underlies the entire system of attack must be examined elsewhere. Meanwhile, it is enough to say that the Christian revelation has not only survived, it has vanquished, Infidelity or Deism. The strength of this system—its theistic belief in God and adherence to the principles of natural theology—proved its weakness. The argument of Analogy was triumphantly applied to show that the believer in a God Who controls the course and constitution of nature ought not to reject the revelation of the Bible, which introduces only a wider extension or larger view of the same scheme of the same God. It silenced all rational opposition to the Christian Faith; and the silencing of opposition is in this case victory. As our Savior said: Ye believe in God, believe also in Me. 1

1 John 14:1. THE CONFLICT WITHSCIENTIFICTHOUGHT.

1. Generally speaking, there has never been any opposition between Christianity and true science. For Christianity pro-fesses to be, and is, a scientific presentation of the largest and broadest philosophy ever expounded to mankind. Hence St. Paul speaks of oppositions of science falsely so-called. 1 True science, or disciplined and formulated knowledge, must needs respect the system of thought which has commanded the homage of so influential a portion of mankind. It is not too much to say that no principle of thinking deserves to be called philosophy, and no results of thinking deserve to be called science, which can despise the Christian Faith. On this subject, however, enough will be found elsewhere. Meanwhile, it is one of the evidences of the truth of our religion that it has survived the attack of many systems of false science. It has in every past age received the homage of the best intellects and most earnest cultivators of both physical and metaphysical truth. This is true of the present age also. And it may be safely said that true Christianity is accepted by a far larger number of rigorous and sound thinkers than is to be found in the service of any one particular department of scientific opposition or perhaps in all departments of scientific opposition put together.

1 1 Timothy 6:20.

2. This being true, it may be granted that it is true only of genuine Christianity. There has been in all Christian ages an unsound development of certain doctrines against which sound science has successfully protested. The Christian Faith ought not to be held responsible for the additions of men; and there can be no doubt that it has pleased God to rebuke by the ministry of human learning many errors which have dimmed or perverted the Faith. During the Middle Ages the authority of the Church was armed in favor of false interpretations of Scripture, and science came to the aid of the simplicity of truth.

Christendom has had much to unlearn and much to learn through its contact with scientific criticism and research. It may have something yet both to unlearn and to learn: many most important helps for the solution of difficulties, the removal of obstacles, and the reconciliation of apparent contradictions in the exegesis of Scripture, may and indeed certainly will be afforded by the investigations of scholars and physicists. Science furnished the key to open some of the dark chambers of cosmogony. And as the origin of things is better understood since modern geology sprang up, so also the origin of man is and will be better understood when the chaos of modern anthropology is reduced to shape. If it should seem in any case that a clear result of inductive science clashes with Scripture or the Christian religion, it will be found, as it has been found in times past, that the contradiction is not real: either the Scripture and the particular truth concerned has been misunderstood, or the scientific induction may itself have to be corrected, or some yet unknown mediatorial fact must be waited for. There is much ground common to science and the Faith in the archaeology, chronology, anthropology, and history of Scripture, not yet fully explored. Meanwhile, science in this relation is comparatively young, and Christianity is absolutely old. The foundation of the eternal verities that make up the relations of God and man has never been shaken by sound human learning and research. On many contested points there is doubtless much controversy. But religion has nothing to fear; and it is a consolation, though a subordinate one, that this is the firm conviction of many who are at once the most profound students of modern science and the most humble disciples of Holy Scripture.

3. There is, however, a false science, a pseudonumos gnosis, 1 which has absolutely withstood Christianity from the beginning; and, with peculiar critical keenness opposes it now. This also it has vanquished in the past; and, though the issue is still pending, it will be victorious now. This science is one with many forms; and it may be called false, for its fundamental principles are unscientific, as destroying the foundations of all human knowledge. If science at all it is the science of nescience: a contradiction in terms.

Skepticism, or suspended judgment on many points, may be tolerated; though universal skepticism is utterly alien from the spirit of the Bible, which appeals to the common sense of mankind against the chaos both of universal skepticism and universal nescience. The same may be said of Pantheistic science: though based on a principle which has commanded the homage of much human thought in all ages, it is not scientific; for it annihilates the distinctness, or at least the permanent distinctness of the thinking subject, whose fleeting phenomena cannot constitute knowledge. Christianity has overcome Pantheism : by the very fact that the noblest Pantheists, the mediaeval, mystical, and the German transcendental philosophers, have aimed to Christianize their system, and, in fact, have held it as Christians. Where it has not leaned on the Christian doctrine of the Trinity it has had no semblance of scientific precision: Spinoza's mathematical system died with himself. Positivism is the supreme delusion of the nineteenth century: professing to be sure and absolute science in every department, it leaves out the endless phenomena which revelation has taught the world, and that with the general consent of all true science, to call spiritual. Materialism is the modern form of Atheism which seems to threaten the hold of religion on men's minds. It is the last and most uncompromising of its enemies: never during earlier ages having risen with anything like strength, it seems now to be encouraged to assault the Faith by the aid of physical science. But sound science must, sooner or later, utterly disavow a system that abolishes the notions of cause and effect, of all final causes and ends, and asserts, in the face of evidence most absolute, the spontaneous origin of life. Most of these forms of the falsely called science will be considered in their appropriate place. Here it is enough to say that they have opposed Christianity in rain. The religion of Christ, with its earlier and later documents, gives a grand and consistent, though at some points most mysterious and unsearchable, explanation of all things. It may be said to have already vanquished all systems and hypotheses which are destructive only and have no positive principles or explanations of their own to substitute for what they take away.

1 1 Timothy 6:20.

THEHOLY GHOSTTHE LAST CEEDENTIAL. No view of the credentials of Divine Revelation is complete which omits a distinct reference to the Holy Ghost, Whose special influence accompanies the Truth as its seal, demonstration, and assurance. This has been of necessity referred to already, and will in due course be more fully exhibited under other aspects and relations. Here it is sufficient to lay down this principle as the sum and conclusion of the whole matter: the Spirit of God and of Christ alone gives to all evidences their force, and imparts to those who sincerely consider them both the faith that believes and the confirmation of that faith.

Moreover, though it may seem a hard saying, the secret of an unbelieving rejection of the Christian Revelation must be traced to an implicit or explicit resistance of His neverfailing and impartial testimony. The presence of the Holy Ghost promised and pledged and bestowed, is the last and

crowning credential of the Faith. THIS CREDENTIAL IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

It will be necessary only to indicate the force of the testimonies of Scripture on this subject: testimonies forming an unbroken series, the course of which may be easily traced by the following leading instances of their use and application.

1. Our Lord, laying the foundation of the Faith, declares that the Spirit of the truth should convict the unbelief of the world: of sin, because, they believe not on Me. 1 Moreover, He promised that same Spirit as the power of the Holy Ghost coming upon you, 2 by which His Apostles should be competent witnesses of Himself. It is most evident that to the Spirit is assigned by the Head of the Faith the function of enforcing its credentials. The Lord could not more expressly have said that the cause of Christianity was to be pleaded for ever by this Advocate or Paraclete. Accordingly, the first preachers of the Gospel appealed to this credential, or relied on this Advocate. St. Peter says of the facts, We all are witnesses; 3 but he then points to the testimony of the Holy Ghost: He hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear. 4 And, at a later time more expressly: We are His witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, Whom God hath given to them that obey Him. 5 The Apostles speak with the consciousness of a higher Witness behind their own, to whose effectual energy they look for the demonstration of their words. The entire apostolic ministry illustrates the same truth. The human witnesses do their best, setting forth, as St. John says, events undeniable: That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, concerning the Word of life. 6 But they never rely only on that. There is a concurrent evidence: The witness of God is greater, 7 the same Apostle declares; and, with plain allusion to the Master's words, adds, And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth: kaí tó Pneúmá estin tó marturoún hóti tó Pneúmá estin hee aleétheia, 8 as if the Spirit were Himself the witness that He Himself is the truth; or, as the Vulgate has it, quoniam Christus est Veritas. Thus the New Testament closes, in St. John's Epistle, with the great truth that the Holy Ghost, given by the Father, is the permanent and, as it were, official proof in the world that God hath given His Son.

He that believeth on the Son of God hath the Witness in himself. 9 Outside of himself, and objectively, there the Savior that came by water and blood: 10 the believer receives the external evidences of the mission of Jesus, both in its commencement by Baptism and at its consummation on the cross. But the Spirit is the supreme Witness within the witness.

1 John 16:8-9; John 16:13; 2 Acts 1:8; 3 Acts 2:32; 4 Acts 2:33; 5 Acts 5:32; 6 1 John 1:1; 7 1 John 5:9; 8 1 John 5:6; 9 1 John 5:10; 10 1 John 5:6.

2. It is very important, in connection with this, to remember that the actual presence of unbelief in the Christian revelation is referred by St. Paul plainly and unambiguously to the rejection of the Spirit: he tells the Corinthians, after reminding them that ye were Gentiles, carried away unto these dumb idols, even as ye were led, that No man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost, 1 words which follow their counterpart, No man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed. Above he had already said that faith standeth in the power of God, that is, in the demonstration of the Spirit and of power. 2 These passages confirm the principle laid down generally in the New Testament, that there is a sense in which faith in the Christian revelation is the gift of God: a gift, that is, bestowed in connection with the prudent and prayerful use of our own faculties. Hence St. John ratifies the whole at the close of Scripture, by saying that every true

Christian that believeth on the Son of God hath the Witness in himself: 3 hath, that is, both the testimony and Him that beareth it within his own soul, as a permanent source of assurance. It is the Spirit that beareth witness, 4 not merely to subjective personal acceptance, but also to the great objective truth which is the ground of that acceptance, to wit, that Jesus is the Son of God. 5 As the anointing of the Holy Ghost was the Father's seal on His Son's mission— for Him hath God the Father sealed—so THE SAME ANOINTING, 6 descending from Him to the skirts of His garments, 7 is the seal that assures to us the truth of His mission and the reality of our interest in Him. St. John therefore says with confidence: ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things: 8 all things, that is, concerning the eternal difference between Christ and Antichrist. That unction of the Holy One, the Revealer, may not instruct in all mysteries, whether of nature or of grace, but if received in humble faith it serves two purposes: it makes the believer confident in Him Whom he trusts as a Savior; and it enables him to detect the liar that denieth that Jesus is the Christ. 9

1 1 Corinthians 12:2-3; 2 1 Corinthians 2:4-5; 3 1 John 5:10; 4 1 John 5:6; 5 1 John 5:5; 6 John 6:27; 7 Psalms 133:2; 8 1 John 2:27; 9 1 John 2:22. ITS PRACTICAL VALUE. This is the bare outline of a doctrine concerning the objective and subjective testimony of the Divine Spirit which the entire New Testament fills up. A careful consideration of the current of its teaching on this subject will convince all, whether students or preachers or defenders of Christianity, that an appeal to the never-absent demonstration of the Holy Ghost is their sheet-anchor for themselves and their last appeal for others.

1. As apologists for the Religion we believe in we must remember for our encouragement the limits of our own obligation. St. Peter instructs the early Christians who had, like us their descendants, to defend their creed, that it was their duty to be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear. 1 We are bound to provide the very best arguments for the Great Hope that our learning and diligence can supply. This is most certainly demanded of us; but nothing more. After all, the Faith is not in our keeping, but in that of the Holy Ghost.

If we happily succeed in disarming opposition or securing attention or exciting the beginnings of trust, the glory is God's: Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts. 2 If we fail, and our opponents harden their hearts, we must not give way to Jonah-like despondency, and fall into the snare of our own ill-success: we must remember that our Master will see to it, and show in His time whose words shall stand Theirs or mine. 3 1 1 Peter 3:15; 2 Zechariah 4:6; 3 Jeremiah 44:28.

2. As preachers also in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength. 1 We must cultivate an absolute reliance on a certain secret Divine testimony which is infallibly given to every truth that we declare: however weakly we proclaim it, provided only we proclaim it faithfully. Here we have the example of the Apostles, who with great fervor argue and persuade, but with the utmost calmness leave the result to God: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, Io, we turn to the Gentiles. 2 But we have a higher example than that of the Apostles. Our Lord Himself, the Supreme Apologist of His own religion, committed His failing cause to His Father. He said, My doctrine is not Mine, but His that sent Me; 3 and when they murmured against Him and His words, He answered their murmurings and said: No man can

come to Me, except the Father Which, hath sent Me draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets. And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto Me. 4 This seems like a tranquil reference of the contest to the arbitration of Heaven, leaving His opponents to their own responsibility. We may humbly copy His example. Our doctrine is not our own, but His Who has sent us; we must leave to His Spirit the responsibility and the justification of the tremendous mysteries we are commissioned to unfold.

1 Isaiah 30:15; 2 Acts 13:46; 3 John 7:16; 4 John 6:44-45.

3. As Christian men, we have to take care that we find our own full assurance of faith in the conscious influence of the Spirit of Christ. No theologian, in these days of doubt and despair of truth, can keep his soul in peace who does not so live that his mind may be the temple of the Holy Ghost, giving him the full assurance of understanding, to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, 1 which is summed up in one word, Christ. A beclouded faith may be traced to many causes; but there is one secret of protection or cure: He that followeth Me shall not walk in darkness. 2 1 Colossians 2:2; 2 John 8:12.

SUMMARY.

Thus far we have only sketched the course that Apologetics may take in presenting the Credentials of the Christian Revelation generally and as such; and as distinct from the evidences necessary to establish particular doctrines and particular documents. When we have to discuss the Canon, and proceed with the separate topics of theology, we shall find ourselves always obliged to maintain a defensive position. The contest is prepared at every point. The Christian system is everywhere militant; and some of the best evidences of the Faith are those which arise under the several heads of its individual dogmas, each of which has its own cause to defend. Meanwhile the general credentials of Christianity prepare the way for those more detailed evidences and add force by anticipation to the arguments introduced to sustain both the books and the doctrines. When the glorious revelation as a whole is accepted, that acceptance renders the mind more accessible to persuasion on subordinate points, and disarms captious criticism of documents and minor difficulties of every kind. When the objective Christian Faith is subjectively received by the faith of man accepting its credentials—credentials adapted to our probation, and amply sufficient, as sealed by the Holy Ghost—then it becomes comparatively easy to proceed to the specific methods by which that Faith has been communicated. The consideration of those methods connects this topic with that which now follows: in which we descend from revelation as objective, universal and one, to the form it assumes in holy books.

05. Vol 01 - Inspiration

Inspiration

INSPIRATION: The Divine Faith REVELATION AND INSPIRATION TESTIMONY OF SCRIPTURE

Old Testament; Our Lord; the Apostles;

DOGMATIC RESULTS THE HOLY GHOST THE INSPIRES THE ORGANS OF INSPIRATION THE SCRIPTURES OF INSPIRATION DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE:

Heathenism;

Judaism;

Patristic;

Mediaeval;

Reformation;

Arminian;

Modern Theories;

Assaults and Defense; The term Divine in the general proposition that the Bible is the Divine Rule of Faith suggests the inspiration and infallible authority of the Sacred Records. Inspiration, distinguished from Revelation as we have employed the term, denotes the specific agency of the Holy Ghost in the creation and construction of Holy Scripture: this is the Biblical conventional use of the word which strictly limits its meaning. The theological treatment of the doctrine requires us to examine, first, the testimony of 'the Bible itself to its own inspiration; secondly, the history of the dogma in the universal Church; and. thirdly, the dogmatic results that may be regarded as fully expressing the truth on this subject. The distinction between the terms Revelation and Inspiration depends, to a great extent, upon their conventional signification. In the Bible we do not trace the distinction found necessary in dogmatic theology, and so elaborately discussed in treatises on the subject.

There are hints, however, that justify us in assigning to each word its particular province.

1. Scripture uses them interchangeably; or, rather, adopts the same forms of expression to exhibit the methods of both. God by divers portions and in divers manners spake in times past to the fathers in the prophets: 1 this includes at once the revelation of all truth to the minds of the prophets, and the inspiration by which they received and administered that truth. The Voice of God pervades the Old Testament; and in the New it still speaketh in His Son. The divers manners 2 include visions, whether in dream or ecstasy, by the medium of which the Holy Ghost presented, with or without symbols, new forms of truth to the mind, or what is always called the Word of the

Lord; and also communications to the waking faculties, conscious of all their own exercises and controlling them. The divers portions cannot well be understood unless we regard them as including the successive stages by which the ancient people were entrusted with the written oracles.

Thus the inspiration and the revelation are one. St. Paul unites them when he says. I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord: 3 a sentence in which all ancient methods are reduced to two, and these are shown to be continued in the New Testament, though no longer so general and characteristic as they formerly had been.

1 Hebrews 1:1; 2 Hebrews 1:2.

2. On the other hand, the Scripture authorizes the conventional phraseology which distinguishes between revelation of truth and inspiration to record it. The Son, in the unity of the Father and the Holy Spirit, is the Revealer. The Spirit, in the unity of the Father and the Son, is the Inspirer. The Son is the living and eternal Word in Whom the eternal ideas of all truth existed, before they were made known; but the Spirit did signify 1 its meaning to the prophets, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. 2 The word Revelation is generally used of THE LORD; 3 the only instance of the use of Inspiration refers it to the Scripture as the result. 4 The disclosure of the mind of God to man is revelation when viewed in relation to the Truth unveiled, and inspiration when viewed in relation to the methods of its impartation and transmission to posterity. And, as revelation must in its highest meaning be limited to the unfolding of the scheme of redemption, so inspiration is limited to that one kind of contact or intercourse between the Holy Spirit and the spirit in man which produced the written Word for all ages and generations.

1 1 Peter 1:11; 2 2 Peter 1:21; 3 2 Corinthians 12:1; 4 2 Timothy 3:16. THE TESTIMONY OF SCRIPTURE ITSELF. The Scripture presents the credentials of its own inspiration. Hence, remembering that in things Divine credentials are always first, and are, if necessary, to be sustained by their own evidences, it is not arguing in a circle to receive the witness of the Bible concerning itself: we must study the whole subject with the Book in our hands. The Old Testament yields its testimony in a manner accordant with its preliminary stage of development; but, though only preliminary, that testimony will be found to include every essential element of the doctrine. Christ, the Revealer, gives His supreme attestation to the authority of the ancient Scriptures: such an attestation, considering His claims, was absolutely necessary; it is expressly given, and of course it is sufficient. He has also with equal expressness, though in a different manner, declared by anticipation the plenary Divine authority of the writings of the New Testament. After exhibiting the evidence of this, we shall descend to the Apostles' testimony concerning the inspiration of the Old Testament and their own; and then may be in a position to sum up the evidence of the Holy Oracles concerning themselves as one united whole. THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. The Old Testament does not lay down the distinction between Revelation and Inspiration; but it furnishes the evidence by which the distinction may be established.

Communications of the Divine will were given in various ways to various men, few of whom, comparatively speaking, were educated and commissioned to write the permanent records of that will. The Patriarchs received revelations, and recorded some of them; but their records were not officially made Scripture by themselves. It was the special prerogative of Moses that he was the

immediate organ of Jehovah, the Logos-Angel: There arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses whom Jehovah knew face to face. 1 Of him it is not recorded that the Spirit made him an instrument: a distinction which was afterwards perverted as we shall see. Of all the inspired agents of Jehovah who testified concerning Christ Moses approached most nearly to the Person Whom he predicted, or rather was brought into closest analogy with Him. After the Uncreated Angel withdrew as the immediate Revealer, phrases are introduced which had not been known before but are used now in great variety. We read of the Spirit of God, 2 or of Jehovah, coming down on men; of the Hand of the Lord 3 moving upon one and another; of the Word of the Lord 4 coming to them.

1 Deuteronomy 34:10; 2 Numbers 24:2; 2 1 Samuel 10:6; 3 2 Chronicles 15:1; 4 Ezekiel 37:14.

2. But, running through all, there is a constant commission to write: from Moses, through Samuel's schools of the prophets, down to the end of the Old Testament. The Lord said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in a book. 1 A large number of references to writing may be collected in the ancient records: to the men appointed to write by the commandment of the Lord; 2 to God as Himself the Writer, I have written to him the great things of My law; 3 to the manner in which the prophetic records especially were arranged and preserved, and Baruch wrote from the mouth of Jeremiah; 4 and to the general designation of the whole as Scripture, I will show thee that which is noted in the SCRIPTURE OF TRUTH. 5 It will be seen by a collation of the multitudes of passages of which these are specimens, that the Old Testament gives all the materials for the full doctrine which is presupposed, sanctioned, and unfolded in the New.

1 Exodus 17:14; 2 Numbers 33:2; 3 Hosea 8:12; 4 Jeremiah 36:1-4; 5 Daniel 10:21. OUR LORD'S TESTIMONY. Our Lord's witness to the inspiration of both Testaments is, to those who believe in Him, the sum of all reasoning. Not indeed that it renders the most careful examination of the documents needless; but a steadfast confidence in the Supreme Authority ought to precede, accompany, and follow every consideration of evidence. Certainly His testimony should more than outweigh all the objections which derive their strength from our ignorance. But that is not all. The Savior's assurances not only confirm the results of inspiration, but throw a clear light upon its nature.

I. In many ways this supreme testimony is given by the Redeemer to the Old Canon as a completed whole.

1. First, by His absolute ascription to its writings of a Divine authority. It was the one thing common to Him and His Jewish opponents that the Scriptures, the same to Him and to them, were admitted to be in all parts the Word and the Writings of God. He asked them: Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition? 1 but said nothing of adding to or diminishing the holy books. They made tradition and that was their fault; but they are not condemned as making or unmaking Scripture. While sweeping away their enfeebling glosses, and giving His own spiritual interpretation, our Lord expressly declared that the least ordinance and the least commandment in the Old Testament was Divine, and must have its fulfillment. Such is the meaning of one jot or one tittle, 2 as connected with what follows.

1 Matthew 15:3; Matthew 15:6; 2 Matthew 5:18

2. He attested the entire Old Testament, secondly, by the terms He was wont to use in speaking of the older oracles. He quotes them as SCRIPTURE generally, and as individual SCRIPTURES. It is written 1 is His answer to the Tempter in the wilderness. Search the Scriptures 2 He said to the Jews and to all men: the solitary instance (taken indicatively) of the commandment: a commandment with promise, They testify of Me. 2 And He began His own prophetic office in the synagogue by proclaiming, This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears. 3 The ancient collection of holy documents He distinguishes according to the current division as the law or the prophets: 4 commandment and promise. In the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning Me. 5 But He unites them all again as the Scriptures in that last unrecorded exposition of the Old Covenant that He gave to His disciples. He once calls an ancient oracle the Word of God, 6 and adds, the Scripture cannot be broken. 7 With this it is instructive to connect our Lord's saying concerning Himself, My words shall not pass away; 8 which asserts at the end of His ministry the same eternal authority for His own teaching which, at the beginning, He had asserted for the law.

1 Matthew 4:7; 2 John 5:39; 3 Luke 4:21; 4 Matthew 5:17; 5 Luke 24:44-45; 6 Luke 24:27; 7 John 10:35; 8 Matthew 24:35 3. The Redeemer never fails to refer to the old Scripture as one testimony, given by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, concerning Himself. How then doth David in Spirit call Him Lord? 1 This is the one instance in which the Spirit's inspiration is directly referred to, and it is a special prophecy concerning David's Lord, uttered by David himself, as a solitary exception to his usual style, and quoted exceptionally by our Savior: in fact, it may be said that the entire Old Testament was represented; it CALLETH HIM LORD. Hence the testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy: 2 this is a dictum which may also be inverted: the Spirit in the whole company of the prophets is the testimony of Jesus. For all the ancient seers both saw and spoke under the influence of the Spirit of Christ which was in them.3 1 Matthew 22:43; 2 Revelation 19:10; 3 1 Peter 1:11.

4. Thus the Savior's witness to the Old Testament is simply perfect in every element that Christian faith can demand. He began and ended His earthly life by declaring its Divine authority and the necessity of its most minute fulfillment. He gave His testimony, not in accommodation to a current notion of the times, but as the Revealer of all truth. And the force of this is specially strengthened by the fact that He sanctions the whole body of holy writers as One who is above them all. What He said of the Baptist was still more applicable to Himself: He is much more than a Prophet. 1 He does not speak, however, as Himself inspired. Though a Prophet, and endued with the Spirit from on high, He never claims for Himself a limited and specific inspiration of the Holy Ghost: in this eternally separated from all the Spirit's agents. As the Son of God incarnate He re-utters the entire Old Testament as His own ancient oracles made new; they as it were died in Him to their transitory meaning, and rose with Him to be the power of an endless life. 1 Luke 7:26.

II. It is of the utmost importance to ask in what sense the Redeemer assures to us a continuation of these authoritative oracles in His own New Testament. We may boldly say that the Great Fulfillment necessarily implied a continuation of Scripture, both as Word and as Writing.

1. Generally, our Lord testified, My words shall not pass away, 1 which is an echo of the sublimest assertions of the Old Testament concerning the Divine oracle. All His sayings on every subject, whether recorded or not, were the words of God. Concerning the whole sum of His teaching He

could bear witness, I have given them Thy word. 2 This being so, can we suppose that such a deposit would die with those who first received it? Their Master made provision that His words should, so far as they were to abide, be preserved in their memory. The promise indeed is very comprehensive, embracing all that the Lord had said. On the Mount of Transfiguration the disciples were bidden to hear Him, 3 and that in the presence of Moses and Elijah. In strict harmony with this is the fact that at the close of His ministry Jesus, more expressly than ever before, made His own sayings the sum of Scripture. It is remarkable that He does not impress upon His disciples the solemn importance of remembering the Scriptures of the Old Testament. It was His own word, — all things whatsoever I have commanded you, 4 —that He left as a legacy. Surely what He said of the sacramental cup may be applied in another way: this is the New Testament IN MY WORDS. The teaching of the Lord was the new Bible; and we feel instinctively how true is the phrase of St. Paul: Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly. 5 The word of Christ is no other than the word of God.

1 Matthew 24:35; 2 John 17:14; 3 Luke 9:35; 4 Matthew 28:20; 5 Colossians 3:16.

2. He has also, both directly and indirectly, guaranteed to us new Scriptural writings.

Though the Divine decorum forbade His leaving anything from His own hand, He did not reverse the ancient law that revelation should be gradually developed in the volume of a book. As Moses was commanded to write the beginning, 1 so St. John was commanded to write the end, of that volume, 2 to finish it as it had been begun. To be more particular: the new Scripture is prepared for and produced by the same Spirit of inspiration Who gave the old records. 3 Precisely the same law of procedure which we have seen in the creation of the earlier documents we see governing the Savior's arrangements for the later. It is as plain as if He had said: By My Spirit I give you new Scriptures. But this He did not declare: all grows out of His words without His saying so. Reserving revelation for Himself, He assigned inspiration to the Holy Ghost, though without giving Him the name of Inspirer; and so described His influence as to make it precisely like that which rested on the ancient writers. In old time, it was said to Moses: Now therefore go, and I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt say; 4 and to Jeremiah: Behold 1 have put My words in thy mouth, and Say not, I am a child. 5 Here a special inspiration for special need is promised, over and above the general inspiration for office.

Compare the words of our Lord to His Apostles, promising the very same special influence: The Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say. 6 It is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost. 7 These are promises in the Synoptists; St. John adds the final and supplementary threefold assurance: the same Spirit will bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you; 8 further, He will show you the things to come; 9 and, generally, He will guide you into all truth. 10 Connecting this special assurance with the Old Testament, the Lord afterwards said, I send the Promise of My Father upon you: 11 as if it were a new function of the Ancient Inspirer that He would impress on their minds. When that promise was fulfilled, they were, like Jeremiah, children no longer, but men in understanding. Now with reference to the three departments of the promise in St. John, the fulfillment required, and therefore included, writing. Let this be carefully considered with regard to each. These are written that ye might believe, 12 for the first. Write the things which thou hast seen, 13 for the second. And the Apostolical Epistles, containing the development of the truth in its manifold applications, is the fulfillment of the third.

1 Exodus 17:14; 2 Revelation 1:19; 3 John 20:31; 4 Exodus 4:12; 5 Isaiah 59:21; 6 Jeremiah 1:7; Jeremiah 1:9; 7 Luke 12:12; 8 Mark 13:11; 9 John 19:26; 10 John 16:13; 11 Luke 24:49; 12 John 20:31; 13 Revelation 1:19.

3. From all this we may assuredly gather that the Mediator of the New Covenant purposed to add another volume to the Scriptures of truth: without plainly saying so, any more than in Genesis He foreannounced the entire Old Testament. The facts declare this without any express declaration. The New Testament is constructed before our eyes exactly as the Old was. The same laws and methods continue in the new economy that were observed in the old. There is the same direct personal teaching, and the Apostles see the Oracle face to face as Moses saw Him. There are the same dreams and ecstasies; and there is the same overruling direction of the Holy Ghost in the compilation of documents. This only great difference exists, that the final truth is communicated by the perfectly revealed Son through the perfectly revealed Spirit; and therefore long times and seasons are in the swift consummation needless. All was accomplished in a single age. The Preparations occupied many centuries; the Fulfillment glorified one. THE APOSTOLIC TESTIMONY. The Apostolic testimony, both to the fact and to the nature of Inspiration, is most ample: the full development of this as of other doctrines is committed to the Apostles.

I. As to the Scriptures generally, or particular Scriptures of the Old Testament, their tribute is explicit and clear.

1. St. Peter, as Preacher and Writer, is perhaps the preeminent witness: in the Acts, to the Jews; in his Epistles, to the Church of Jews and Gentiles; in both, to future generations. On the eve of Pentecost he gives what may be called a classical text: édei pleerootheénai teén grafeén heén proeípen tó Pneúma tó Hágion diá stómatos Davíd. 1 This is the Pentecostal witness once for all: in a form more complete than anywhere else, as it were a general definition. The Holy Ghost spake; 2 using the mouth of David an instrument, also that of Joel; and the result was Scripture in one particular expression of it: whether as uttered or as written it is identical. Nor is St. Stephen less clear: he says that Moses received lógia zoónta, living oracles; doúnai heemín, 3 to transmit to posterity, here again the spoken and the written oracles being identical. St. Peter's Epistles contain important evidence. No prophecy of Scripture is of private interpretation—idías epilúseoos,4 referring to the prophet's own knowledge—but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost. As to the Biblical writings in particular, there is much weight in his expression, the other Scriptures, 5 when viewed on all sides. A shorter phrase in the first Epistle adds to the words and the writings of the prophets the element of their authority if any man speak, speaking as if the oracles of God, 6 which are supposed to be the standard of all truth in doctrine and in ethics.

1 Acts 1:16; 2 Acts 1:16; 3 Acts 7:38; 4 2 Peter 1:20-21; 5 2 Peter 3:16; 6 1 Peter 4:11.

2. The Epistle to the Hebrews furnishes the most ample series of testimonies to be found in the New Testament. The force of these is to be felt only by an examination of the texture of the whole composition, which literally regards the ancient Scriptures as oracles spoken by the Holy Ghost, and preserved for the Christian Church in a book to be quoted from as infallible. It is remarkable that the same expression is throughout used to indicate the testimony of the Spirit and that of the writer whom He employs: The Holy Ghost 1 testifieth the terms of the great covenant in Jeremiah; and One in a certain place testified, 2 meaning the Psalmist. While in this document God absolutely is the Revealer, and the Son the supreme medium of revelation, the Spirit is specially

connected with the written Scripture. It may be added, that the first principles of the oracles 3 are represented as the same in the Old Testament and in the New: the rudiments which these Christians needed to be taught again were the principles of the doctrine of Christ; 4 and, as these had been taught in the Christian writings, these writings were also THE DIVINE ORACLES.

1 Hebrews 10:15; 2 Hebrews 2:6; 3 Hebrews 5:12; 4 Hebrews 6:1.

3. St. Paul also, both as Preacher and Writer, lives and moves in the ancient Scriptures.

He quotes them constantly, and always as containing the Voice and the Writings of God. His manner of introducing individual texts shows plainly the importance he attached to the very words used by the Holy Ghost. For instance: He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one. And to thy seed, which is Christ. 1 He uses a wide variety of epithets, such as The Prophetic Scriptures, 2 Holy Scriptures, 3 Sacred Writings, 4 and Scripture given by inspiration of God. The last two contain his final testimony to Timothy; and they together declare that the Hallowed or Sacred writings applied by faith in Christ impart saving wisdom; and that all Scripture is Divinely inspired. The term Theópneustos, as a predicate of grafeé, has given the theological word Inspiration its Scriptural ground, sanctioning also the extension of the term to the writings as well as the words and the persons of the inspired men. St. Peter's great testimony signalizes the impulse of the Spirit on the minds of the prophets: they were ferómenoi, led or borne along. St. Paul supplements this by making emphatic the result in the written Word in its widest extent, embracing much more than the word of prophecy. The former leans rather to the revelation, the latter to the inspiration, of the ancient documents; but both include the collected oracles, and their saving power to the believing recipient. Together, they condense into two short sentences the entire Biblical doctrine of the inspiration of Scripture: that is, primarily though not only, of Old-Testament Scripture.

1 Galatians 3:16; 2 Romans 16:26; 3 Romans 1:2; 4 2 Timothy 3:15-16.

II. It is most important to collect the Apostles' testimony to their own inspiration. But it must be remembered that, though always conscious of the Spirit's special influence, they would only on defensive occasions be likely to refer to it. In fact, the service of the Gospel required them on very many occasions to abstain from urging their highest claim.

1. St. John is the Apostle who gives the faintest expression to the specific gift of inspiration, while he is, perhaps, the most earnest in the assertion of the authority that resulted from it. Yet in the Apocalypse he says that he was, when he received his prophetic communications, in the Spirit, 1 the very term applied by our Lord to the inspiration of David: no prophet was ever more effectually moved by the Holy Ghost 2 than he. He speaks of those sayings as faithful and true 3 which he wrote to the churches by commandment of the Lord, as if they were his own: and the fearful words that end this book, if not the Bible, declare its inviolable Divine authority. In his First Epistle he seems to make the unction from the Holy One 4 a privilege of all Christians; but a close examination will give reason to think that he referred primarily to the Apostolic chrísma, or anointing, which was also a chárisma, or gift, not limited to himself, and therefore not made prominent as his own, but his in the unity of the whole Apostolate. Supposing, however, that the anointing is spoken of as belonging to all regenerate believers, we fall back upon the tone of superhuman authority which is impressed upon this document, as upon the two lesser Epistles

accompanying it.

1 Revelation 1:10; 2 2 Peter 1:21; 3 Revelation 22:6; 4 1 John 2:20.

2. St. Peter speaks of the writings of St. Paul as co-ordinate, on the same level, with the other Scripture: 1 a slight hint of an understood and current way of thinking has the force of a strong argument. It must be remembered that he had just before been referring to his reason for writing a second Epistle: That ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandment, through your Apostles, of the Lord and Savior. 2 Hence there can be no question that he placed the apostolical company by the side of the prophetic; and that he regarded himself, as well as his beloved brother Paul, as representatives, in their writings and words, of the supreme authority of the common Master. For it is well known that Words and Writings are in Scripture often used interchangeably. In their ministry, applying his own language, we have the word of prophecy made more sure. 3 The day has dawned.

1 2 Peter 3:16; 2 2 Peter 3:1-2; 3 2 Peter 1:19.

3. As to St. Paul himself, there can be no question of his claiming the authority of inspiration. Not being numbered with those who had companied with the Lord and received His great promise on the eve of the Passion, it was necessary that he should dwell more on the prerogatives of his irregular investiture. He speaks specially for himself, though as the representative of all, when he claims so often to wield, both in presence and by letters, the very authority of Christ. His reference to matters not given of commandment 1 must not be misunderstood. He does not mean that he wrote merely on his own authority; but that in these particular cases he could not and did not appeal to any distinct and specific utterance of Christ. Yet it is observable that he is never more peremptory than in giving the decisions which are not settled by the precedents of the Supreme Master Himself. St. Paul does not separate between his personal life and character as aMan 1:2 and: his official relation to the churches; though he distinguishes between Christ revealed IN him, 3 and the new Faith revealed UNTO him, 4 and the Gospel fully known BY him; 5 these three filling up the whole compass of his new life. He ascribes his revelations to Christ as the Revealer, 6 but to inspiration the words used which the Spirit teacheth. 7 In short, had he been present in the paschal upper room, he could not more abundantly have asserted his possession of the privileges of the Apostolic company. His letters were to be read in the churches as the very Word of the Lord, and for his least counsels he can say, I think that I also have the Spirit of God: 8 a style of speaking sometimes regarded as meaning no more than the common Christian privilege, but never in the New Testament so used. The Apostle's habitual thought was molded by the Old Testament, where such language is reserved for the organs of inspiration; for instance, the spiritual man of the prophet is literally the man of the Spirit.8

1 1 Corinthians 7:6; 1 Corinthians 7:12; 2 Romans 3:5; 3 Galatians 1:16; 4 Ephesians 3:3; 5 2 Timothy 4:17; 6 1 Corinthians 2:13; 7 1 Cor 2:40; 8 Hosea 9:7.

4. The two historical Evangelists, and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who shared not directly the great promise given to the Apostles, shared it indirectly. St. Mark and St. Luke had for their special province those subjects concerning which the promise was given by the Savior, and under the direction of St. Peter and St. Paul. No writings bear more undeniably the signs of an Apostle 1 than, these: and St. Luke's especially are most essential to the living organism of the

New Testament. But the consideration of their contributions belongs to the study of the Canon.

1 2 Corinthians 12:12.

5. To sum up all. The writers of the New Testament form a body of men, united in the unfolding of Christian doctrine, who always deliver their message as from God their Savior by His Holy Spirit. They do not often assert their inspiration: but it is everywhere implied by themselves and supposed to be understood by their hearers and readers. In this they occupy precisely the same position as their predecessors in the Old Testament. Like them, they stand before the people of God with infallible teaching from which there is no appeal; like them, they occasionally declare themselves, when their authority is resisted, to be organs of the Spirit. In a word, they simply take the place in the New Temple of the prophets in the Old: continuing their office and ministration by a commission the credentials of which were known and read of all men.

DOGMATIC.

Dogmatic Theology has a clear account to give of Inspiration. The Scriptures, fairly compared and interpreted, declare it to be that special influence of the Holy Ghost on the minds of holy men. Selected for the purpose, which qualified them to communicate, from age to age, an infallible record of Divine truth concerning the redeeming will of God. This is the conventional meaning attached to the term both in earlier and later Christian times. Save with this meaning the word inspiration becomes comparatively vague and valueless. Here we have to consider the Inspiring Spirit; then the Inspired Organs; and lastly the Scriptures of Inspiration. THE HOLY GHOST THE INSPIRER. The Holy Ghost, in the Mediatorial Trinity, is, and is alone, the Author of inspiration. This is His personal honor, and implies perfection in His work. To the ground of this office in the Absolute Trinity we cannot penetrate any more than we can penetrate to the ground of the revealing function of the Word; enough, that as the Revealing Son is the Eternal Word, so the Inspiring Spirit, eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son, is the supreme and sole medium of communication to the spirit of man. Whatever the Son is to the creature the Spirit COMMUNICATES. In the Mediatorial Trinity the Holy Ghost presides over the impartation of truth. This may be illustrated by His relation to the Person of the Revealer generally, and particularly by the terms employed in the phraseology of Scripture on the subject.

1. It is true, throughout the entire economy of redemption, that the Spirit reveals the Son as the Son reveals the Father. The preparations for Christ in the former times, whether in natural or in supernatural revelation, were under His control; and especially the latter. The testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy; 1 and it was the Spirit of Christ which was in them 2 that signified through the prophets that future redemption which is the sum of revealed truth. The New Testament fully discloses both the Revealer and His interpreting Spirit: the One as much as the Other. As all truth comes through the Son Who revealeth what He hath heard of My Father, 3 so the inspiration of the Spirit has always made man capable of receiving the revelation. The Holy Ghost fulfils Christ's Divine word: He shall not speak of Himself. 4 And, precisely as the work of Christ was fully made known when He appeared among men, so the office of the Spirit as the Inspirer of the permanent records of that work was fully known only after His Pentecostal coming.

1 Revelation 19:10; 2 1 Peter 1:11; 3 John 15:15; 4 John 16:13.

2. The phraseology of Scripture has been seen to be faithful to this truth. There is a gradual unfolding of it from the beginning. The Spirit is dimly, though less and less dimly, alluded to in the Old Testament as the Inspirer: in the songs of the neutral ground between the Old and the New Testaments He is more clearly spoken of: until after Pentecost He becomes the representative of all the revelations of the Holy Trinity. This principle must regulate our interpretation of certain passages that might seem to speak otherwise: that is, with less distinctive reference to the Holy Ghost as the Inspirer. God is said to have spoken or done what is spoken or done by each Person in the Trinity: a canon this of great importance generally. It was the Lord, the God of Israel, who wrought redemption for His people; 1 but the Son was the Redeemer. God sent His Son: 2 but St.John's testimony goes on that the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world. 3 So it is said that God spake unto the fathers in the prophets; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. 4 The Scripture is God-inspired, Theópneustos, 5 but only the Spirit is the Inspiring God.

1 Luke 1:68; 2 1 John 4:10; 1 John 4:14; 3 Hebrews 1:1; 4 2 Peter 1:21; 5 2 Peter 3:16.

3. Hence special honor is due and should be paid to the Holy Ghost in His office and province: He is the God of Scripture. In this domain He is supreme; according to the Nicene Confession, which introduces this Divine work into the highest act of worship: WHO SPAKE BY THE PROPHETS. It is therefore not to be wondered at or condemned that we pay also a certain homage to the Scriptures as His finished work. What is wrongly charged upon this submission as Bibliolatry is a becoming sentiment of reverence for the Spirit in His word. Of Him also it may be said, His work is perfect, 1 despite any supposed appearances to the contrary. As creation and providence and redemption are finished and complete severally, so also is the organization of the Scripture: perhaps all the more perfect because of some things which we in our ignorance count imperfection.

1 Deuteronomy 32:4. THE ORGANS OF INSPIRATION. The men chosen of the Holy Ghost to be the organs of inspiration were by Him sanctified through the truth for their office; their faculties were prepared by His influence for the special province of inspiration assigned to them individually; and He superintended and controlled the exercise of those faculties for the accomplishment of His own end in the construction of Scripture.

1. St. Peter, referring to the prophetic Word, says of the prophets: men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost. 1 It may be affirmed of all the instruments used for this high function that they were under the common sanctifying inspiration or influence of the Spirit. It is true that revelations were given—that is, disclosures of truth, and visions of the future—both in the Old Testament and in the New to men who were raised up to this end, but were personally unsanctified: but Balaam and Caiaphas, though they received a transitory inspiration, were not employed to perpetuate or hand down their predictions.

They were used for a purpose, and their enforced ministry was taken up, like Pharaoh's, into the Divine plan. Similarly, certain writings, not themselves written by inspired men, are incorporated into the fabric of Scripture. These were all exceptions to the general rule, that only those who are in harmony with truth and under its sanctifying influence received its higher revelations.

1 2 Peter 1:21.

2. But the Spirit used His instruments as men: their sanctity, or special consecration to their task, was the sanctification of their natural endowments, acquisitions, and study.

They were not passive in the writing of Scripture, even to that degree in which they were passive in receiving revelation. They wrote, sometimes after long interval, what they had received; and always according to the characteristics of their individual genius, style of thoughts, and diction. But their faculties were raised, invigorated, and strengthened to their highest pitch. What has been termed the DYNAMICAL theory of inspiration, — namely, that its influence acted upon and through the faculties of the inspired person, —is proved to be true by all the phenomena of the several books. From the record of the most transcendent visions down to the simplest private letter, the writer in Scripture is true to himself. No individual author in the classical literature of Greece or Rome differs more from every other than every writer in Scripture differs from his fellow. Chronicler from Chronicler, Prophet from Prophet, Evangelist from Evangelist, Apostle from Apostle.

3. Inspiration proper is then the specific influence on the mind, after these pre-requisites are provided for. And, although no distinctions in degree are alluded to in Scripture, the evidence may be found there that the one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as He will, 1 regulated His inspiring influence by the need.

1 1 Corinthians 12:11.

(1.) There are some portions of the Holy Writings in which pure revelation and inspiration coincide; where the inspiring Spirit would suggest the truth, and also the words in which to clothe it; in fact, use His instruments almost mechanically to subserve His purpose. It may not be easy to distinguish in every case the results of the VERBAL inspiration; and the fact that the autographs of the Bible have disappeared proves that the Holy Ghost has allowed nothing vital to depend on such a distinction. The most sacred words of our Lord are reproduced with slight variations by those to whose remembrance they were recalled; but we observe that His promise ran: He shall teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance, pánta há, whatsoever I have said unto you. 1 The fluctuation of the expressions used by the several reporters does not invalidate the assumption that in much of Scripture there is the inspiration of SUGGESTION, especially of the things and sometimes of the very words.

1 John 14:26.

(2.) Many parts of the Bible, especially of the New Testament, are the logical development and formal arrangement of doctrine. St. Paul in his Epistles reasons from the Old Testament in assertion and defense of New-Testament truth; just as he and the other preachers of the Gospel proved from Scripture that Jesus was Christ. It is most obvious that in the conduct of his argument he uses his faculties according to the discipline of his youth. But he himself tells us that he also used words which the Holy Ghost teacheth, 1 and enjoyed that special inspiration of the Spirit which was promised by our Lord: He will guide you into all truth, hodeegeései, 2 He shall guide you in the way of reflection, argument, and sound exposition. All the Apostles received for the Church and the world what the Two received on the morning of the resurrection, and the Eleven afterwards: Then opened He their under standing, that they might understand the Scriptures. 3 1 1 Corinthians 2:13; 2 John 16:13; 3 Luke 24:45.

(3.) A large portion of Scripture is testimony to fact, of various kinds; and no theory of inspiration of witnesses can be accepted which should destroy their independent character as witnesses. They were inspired or moved to deliver their independent and faithful testimony. Sometimes they have to register facts, or supposed facts, which they gather from public records; sometimes to record traditions, legends, current opinions, or uninspired predictions handed down by tradition: in these cases they are only witnesses of what they found. Sometimes they have to narrate events in which they had taken part to a greater or less extent: in this case they are directed to chronicle the result of their own investigations, each according to his own lights. Occasionally they are concurrent witnesses of transactions which they observed from different points of view: under such circumstances there is no previous harmonizing of the testimonies, but each gives his own faithful witness, according to his Divinely aided remembrance, the Divine aid, however, not necessarily rectifying the original defect or incompleteness of observation.

Hence arise certain differences of presentation which the free Spirit has permitted: differences which are just enough to show that the witnesses are sent to give their evidence as independent, never enough to betray the supreme cause of truth.

(4.) Once more, much of the Scripture is the result of what would be called among men editorial arrangement. This extends over a considerable portion of the Old Testament, and is what St. Luke, for instance, in the New claims for his own function. Now the presiding and controlling influence of the Spirit was as much needed for this as for any other department of the economy of revelation; but His inspiration was of a different character.

He taught His instruments to distinguish in Hebrew literature what was His own and what was not; He superintended the arrangement of the Psalms; He taught the Evangelists to sift the oral traditions which were rich with the deposits and memorials of the Sacred Life; and, generally, He watched over and directed the construction of organic Holy Writ as one great body of Literature, in many human respects like all other literature, but Divinely distinguished from every other. THE SCRIPTURES OF INSPIRATION. The Scriptures themselves may be said to be inspired as containing the permanent mind of the Spirit, and being the organ of His abiding and living influence. Hence this attribute in many ways distinguishes them from all other literature, sacred and secular.

TITLES The names given to the collection of Books confirm all that has been said of them: whether those names are found in the Bible itself, or are the reverent invention of later times. The writers themselves use the very highest appellatives; and never refer to the contents of the volume as a whole, or to any the least fragment of it, without some expression of deep reverence. This habit was not confined to the Jews, ancient or modern, whose well-known reverence approached superstition: it is shared by the disciples whom their Lord forbade to call any man master on earth, who had brought them a new law, and most certainly would not have suffered them to give such titles to any but the writings of God. In this, too, they had His example. They are the SACRED WRITINGS, tá hierá grámmata, 1 Thus St. Paul speaks of the Old Testament, and in a connection which shows that the things which Timothy received through faith in Christ Jesus were of equal authority, and therefore that the New was to be included. Scripture everywhere, they are in this closing page HOLY SCRIPTURE: The Writings pre-eminently, which refer not to the passing phenomena of time, but to the things of eternity. This is the only title they receive as a whole. They

are the WORD OF GOD, however, in the estimation of Christians, as enshrining the Evangelical record of the work of Christ which liveth and abideth for ever; 2 so, as containing the compendium of all the distinct revelations which are called individually the Words of God; and finally as suggesting, what indeed they do not express, the close connection between the inspired Word and the Word Incarnate. It is in some cases difficult to decide exegetically whether the term Logos 3 refers to the Eternal Word or to the word spoken.

1 2 Timothy 3:15; 2 1 Peter 1:23; 3 Hebrews 4:12-13.

AUTHORITY.

1. Its plenary inspiration makes Holy Scripture the absolute and final authority, allsufficient as the supreme Standard of Faith, Directory of Morals, and Charter of Privileges to the Church of God. Of course, the Book of Divine revelations cannot contain anything untrue; but its infallibility is by itself especially connected with religious truth. It constitutes, as will be hereafter seen, the absolute Canon or Book of Faith. It is comparatively silent as to human science; it has its own laws of grammar and rhetoric; it quotes traditions and admits records as testimony without pledging itself to their exactness. It does not profess to be Divine in any such sense as should remove it from human literature: a Bible of that kind would be something very different from what we have. It is, after all, a Divine-human collection of documents: the precise relation of the human to the Divine is a problem which has engaged much attention, and has not yet been, though it may yet be, adequately solved. But in the domain of religious truth, and the kingdom of God among men, its claim to authority and sufficiency is absolute.

2. The evidence of the inspiration of the Scriptures belongs rather to the historical review which will follow. It is sufficient to say here that it is found in its own testimony, confirmed by its effects. Here once more we must needs argue in what seems to be a circle. In fact, there are no evidences to be brought to the question from without: only credentials from within. The Book may be said to be inspired. St. Paul uses that expression, not of the writers, but of what they write; and points to its profitable uses for the proof. His words, already quoted, may be quoted again as the last authoritative assertion on the subject which the Scriptures themselves contain. Every Scripture inspired of God is also profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.1 This was St. Paul’s final testimony, one of his Faithful Sayings: uttered when all his own writings were in the world, concerning which St. Peter used the same term grafás, classing them with the other Scriptures.2 When he thus spoke to Timothy, he was himself giving him instruction which the older Scriptures could not give: hence the New Testament is included with the Old in the general declaration. The power of the holy oracles in the souls of all who study them has mostly been recognized as its supreme credential. The Holy Ghost lives in the Word: and His testimony to that Word, as the organ of His grace, is irresistible to the believer. To the unbeliever as such the inspiration of the Bible cannot be proved.

1 2 Timothy 3:16; 2 2 Peter 3:16.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT. The subject of Inspiration occupies a large place in the history of religious thought and ecclesiastical polemics; which is not to be wondered at, considering the vast issues at stake. On the question whether God has given to His people an authoritative revelation of His will hangs every interest of truth, assurance, and certitude of faith. If the Bible is what our

doctrine of inspiration asserts it to be, many great questions of controversy among the Churches are, or ought to be, at once settled by it. This gives harmony where all else is confusion. But the doctrine has been and is impugned: and we must consider well the attacks upon a position so vital. Hence a general view of its development is very important in the settlement of the doctrine. In order to make the survey complete, it is well to consider the universal tradition of mankind, the judgment of the Jewish Church, the ecclesiastical dogmas in Christendom, and the present state of opinion and controversy as to the nature and effect of inspiration.

HEATHENISM. In common with every doctrine of the Faith, this one had its distorted shadow in the heathen world; but the distinction we establish between Revelation and Inspiration is not here to be expected. Generally, a sentence of Cicero may speak for all: Vetus opinio est, jam usque ab heroicis duct a temporibus, eaque et populi Romani et OMNIUM GENTIUM firmata consensu, versari quandam inter homines divinationem. More particularly, the manteis or Prophets, announcing their frenzied oracles; the Poets, feigning or not feigning a special influence on their minds; and the Lawgivers, of whom Numa is only a representative, correspond, in a certain sense, to the Prophecy, to the Hagiographa or Psalms, and to the Law, of the Jewish doctrine of inspiration. In a certain sense only, however: for heathenism knew nothing, nor pretended to know anything, of a great system of supernatural truth revealed to the minds of men.

JUDAISM. The JEWISH CHURCH, before the Old-Testament Canon closed, had an absolute faith in the inspiration of Moses and the Prophets, and the authors of the other Holy Writings. They inherited a large miscellaneous literature, but carefully distinguished and held sacred that portion which was given them directly from above; and that distinction guided, as will be hereafter seen, the settlement of the Canon. The Judaism of the Interval retained, with scarcely perceptible diminution of intensity, the same faith. The apocrypha] authors assert the essential difference between human and Divine writings. In the book which Baruch wrote in Babylon. God is appealed to in these terms: As Thou spakest by Thy servant Moses in the day when Thou didst command him to write Thy law. Tobit also instructs his son to depart out of Nineveh, because that those things which the prophet Jonas spake shall surely come to pass. In Ecclesiasticus we read of many prophets by name, and of Isaiah who saw by an excellent Spirit what was to come to pass at the last, and he comforted them that mourned in Sion. 1 Jonathan, seeking the friendship of the Lacedemonians, professes nevertheless not to need it, for that we have the holy books of Scripture in our hands to comfort us. The book of Ecclesiasticus in its occasional high prophetic tone seems to claim inspiration; but its claim was never admitted; and it prays indeed for the restoration of lost prophecy, from the cessation of which events were dated: raise up prophets that have been in Thy Name; 2 as we read also in Maccabees, So there was a great affliction in Israel, the like whereof was not since the time that a prophet was not seen among them. Philo, an Alexandrian Jew, betrays the influence of Greek thought; but he has a high theory of inspiration, and declares that the prophets are Divine Interpreters, God making use of them as organs to manifest His will, suggesting what they must say. Josephus represents the purer Palestinian belief: "It is implanted in every Jew from the hour of his birth to esteem these writings as the ordinances of God, and to stand by them; in defense of them, if need be, cheerfully to die." He, like Philo, includes the historical books among the records of inspiration; and assigns an equal value to all inspired utterances. With later Judaism we need not much concern ourselves. It has lost its authority as a witness, in consequence of its opposition to the Third Person of the Holy Trinity

Whom Christianity has honored as the Inspirer. Moses Maimonides, in the twelfth century, was the first to devise three stages of inspiration: the MOSAIC, without dream, fearless, face to face, constant, in which none shared the prerogative of Moses; the PROPHETIC, in which the pure truth was simply unveiled; and that of the KETHUBIM, or Hagiographa, given by the Holy Spirit disclosing part of the truth in dreams or otherwise.

Maimonides is the master genius of modern orthodox Judaism: "A Mose ad Mosem non surrexit sicut Moses" is a saying that expresses its method of rejecting the Prophet greater than Moses. But, apart from these philosophical notions of modern Judaism, the residuary and obsolete Jewish Church—if it may be so called—has always been faithful to its original and high doctrine of inspiration.

1 Ecc. 48:24; 2 Ecc. 36:15. THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. In the Christian Church the dogma has had an important process of development, or rather of variations in theological opinion.

PATRISTIC.

1. The Patristic age furnishes no definition of inspiration, but a very high doctrine was maintained. The Apostolical Fathers quote the Old Testament exactly as the Apostles do: with the same reverent trust, and also with the same freedom. Clemens Romanus, the first uninspired Christian writer, assigns to the Scriptures of both Testaments the fullest inspiration; they are "the true sayings of the Holy Ghost." Polycarp quotes the Apostles' words as being words of Scripture; and St. Paul in particular is by more than one said to write as theopneustos, or divinitus inspiratus. Generally these earliest authorities make the Two Testaments One Scripture. The Apologists unanimously teach, or rather exhibit, almost a mechanical idea of it; some of them, however, limiting its range to religious truth. They adopt the figure of the Lyre on which the Holy Ghost discoursed. Justin Martyr used this figure in what may be regarded as the first theological definition: Oute thuses oute anthrospins ennoia could men know such great and heavenly things, but by a gift, doron, coming down on them . . .phktron, osper organo kith apas tinos ho luras chomenon. Tertullian, who invented many theological terms, first used that of INSPIRATIO. The early Fathers generally and as a body maintained the same high view: Origen, erring on many other points, held on this the highest theory. Chrysostom and Augustine make the prophets the Mouth and the Hand of God: the latter speaks of the venerabilem stylum Sanctae Scripturae. The NICENE CREED includes the Apostles when it confesses to the Holy Ghost WHO SPAKE BY THE PROPHETS; this was the witness of the early and undivided Church to the inspiration of the Old Testament through the agency of the Personal Spirit, TO LALHSON DIA TON PROTHTON. In harmony with this the Holy Ghost was called THE PROPHETIC SPIRIT: Pneuma te to prophtikon sebometha kai proskunouhen. On the whole, the Patristic Church was faithful to the doctrine which the last of the early Fathers, Gregory the Great, represented when he said: "It is needless to ask what writer wrote, as the Holy Ghost was the only author: it is superfluous to inquire with what pen an author writes." An appeal to the words of the Old or the New Testament, of either or of both, was an end of all controversy in those days as it is in our own.

2. Withal there were, as might be expected, the germs of later freedom and indeed laxity. The Montanist heresy, which assumed a series of Pentecosts and administrations of the inspiring Spirit, was wholly rejected; but it has had its modern representatives. The Alexandrian doctors, generally sound, here and there allude to an inspiration common to the prophecies of heathenism

and Scriptural prophecies. Tertullian sometimes spoke, as others have spoken since, of an inspiration of all edifying books. Origen and Augustine seem to have admitted that some portions of the Bible were given without inspiration, or by inspiration of a limited degree, some authors, even more than they, laid stress upon the subjective or human element. And this was carried in the Antiochene school, represented by Theodore of Mopsuestia, to an extreme: the writers were mirrors reflecting according to their polish. Theodore was condemned by the Fifth Ecumenical Council for surrendering certain books of the Old Testament and of the New. But, like Luther, who followed him in this, he held a high doctrine as to the inspiration of what he accepted; though, like Luther, applying a subjective canon of his own to determine what ought to be Scripture or what ought to be excluded.

MEDIAEVAL. In the Mediaeval Church, the doctrine of inspiration was obscured by the gradual elevation of Tradition into a co-ordinate rank: in fact, the notion of two inspirations—that of the Spirit in the Bible, and of the Spirit in the Church — was gradually established. But the theory did not otherwise suffer: the words of Scripture were still regarded as having a normal authority of their own. Fredegisus of Tours (804) even laid down a most rigorous mechanical statement on the subject. But he was-opposed by freer theories, which in the rationalist treatment of Abelard and the subtile disquisitions of Thomas Aquinas anticipated later distinctions of the Spirit’s inspiring influence. The-Mystics, who in this age were mostly Pantheistic in their tendencies, gave up any definite doctrine of inspiration, making it common to all saints in their intuition of Divine things; and they thus provoked in some of the precursors of the Reformation a recoil to the most rigid possible views. Meanwhile the coordination of oral tradition steadily advanced, until it was formulated at the Council of Trent thus: Sanctus Synodus, hoc sibi perpetuo ante oculos proponens, ut sublatis erroribus puritas ipsa evangelii in ecclesia conservetur, perspiciensque hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus, quae ex ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptae, aut ab ipsis Apostolis S. S.dictante, quasi per manus traditae ad nos usque pervenerunt. orthodoxorum patrum exempla secuta omnes libros tam V. quam N. T., cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, necnon traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem quum ad mores pertinentes, tan-quam vel ore tenus a Christo vel a S. S. dictatas et continua successione in Ecclesia Catholica conservatas, PARA PIETATIS AFFECTO AC REVERENTIA suscipit et veneratur. Si quis autem traditiones praedictas sciens et prudens contemserit, anathema sit.

THEREFORMATION. The Reformation began in earnest the discussion of the dogma, as bound up with its cardinal principle, of the sufficiency of Scripture for all things pertaining to human salvation.

1. Its leaders were lax in their first decisions. Luther insisted on a material inspiration, as to doctrine, and a formal, as to the manner, which was of less importance: he subjected the books of the New Testament to the criterion of his own judgment as to their Evangelical character, and rejected, for instance, the Epistle of St. James. Calvin went also very far in the admission of the human peculiarities. Hence, their Romish opponents found in this laxity a strong argument in favor of Tradition. The Formularies of the two branches of the Reformation varied. The Augsburg Confession is content with the absolute regulative authority of Scripture: "Regulam autem habemus, ut verbum Dei condat articulos fidei." The Reformed Confessions were stronger: the "Formula Consensus Helvetici" says: "Hebraicus codex V. T., tum quoad consonas, tum quoad vocalia, sive puncta ipsa sive punctorum saltem potestatem, et tum quoad res tum quoad verba,

Theopneustos." This was directed against Luther, who asserted that wood, hay, and stubble might be in the prophets, though the substance was there that could not be burned. The Anglican Articles are like the Lutheran more negative, the Westminster Confession more rigid. But the dogmatic divines of the new Churches tended gradually to the very highest rigor, as expressed in the Helvetic Formulary: thus Buxtorf maintained, irrationally, that the very vowel points of the Hebrew were inspired. In harmony with this, they asserted that the TESTIMONIUM SPIRITUS SANCTI was the sole ground of assurance as to the Divine authority of Scripture, while the Affectiones Scripture vindicated it to human faith and commended it to human acceptance: two incontrovertible truths, which, however, needed not the mechanical or Rabbinical doctrine.

2. The recoil from this extreme was to be expected. The reaction commenced with the early ARMINIAN divines, who reserved the direct action of the Spirit for matters of faith, leaving historical research and memory to do their part. Thus Grotius says: A Spiritu Sancto dictari historias non opus fuit; satis fuit scriptorem memoria valere, aut diligentia in describendis veterum commentariis. The later Lutherans introduced grades of inspiration: Calixtus, those of Revelation and Assistance; Pfaff, those of Revelation, Direction as to dogma, and Permission as to all else. Witsius, however, in Holland, revived and maintained the more rigid view. The Jesuits, in the sixteenth century, introduced a convenient theory of POSTSPIRATIO, which should retrospectively elevate such books as the Maccabees into Scripture. This was protested against by the University of Louvain (1588), and left undecided by Sixtus V. The Romish Church has never gone beyond Perrone, one of its living representatives: " Diximus saltem QUOAD RES ET SENTENTIAS, quia cum noluerit Ecclesia definire, seu dirimere quaestionem inter scholasticos agitatam, utrum preterea Deus verba ipsa dictaverit, nexumque verborum et periodorum, ideo ne controversiam domesticam cum ecclesiae doctrina temere permisceremus, coarctavimus propositionis sensum ad rei substantiam, sine qua vera Inspiratio Divina neque est neque intelligi quidem potest." Meanwhile modern Mysticism has made the Internal Light co-ordinate with inspiration, just as Romanism has made Tradition. The highest Mystics, of all communions, rose sublimely above the written Word. The Pietists, however, such as Arndt, Spener, and the Bengel School, paid full honor to the written Scripture, maintaining, however, the supremacy of the Living Spirit. The Quakers in their formularies—for they have them—give ambiguous statements: Barclay supposes that the Scripture only guides the Christian’s internal standard. The early Socinians believed in inspiration: without the specific Personal Inspirer, though as a specific influence. The Racovian Catechism indicates traces of the truth from which modern Unitarianism has declined, as it has receded from many of the other higher doctrines of Socinianism.

MOREMODERNHYPOTHESES.

1. Most orthodox churches have more recently endeavored to maintain a doctrine of Plenary inspiration in harmony with the notion of different DEGREES. Rejecting the terms MECHANICAL and VERBAL, as both inconsistent with the human element, they have sometimes used DYNAMICAL, as indicating that the inspiring influence was not so much UPON as IN and THROUGH the writers; the result, however, being the infallible Rule of Faith delivered by the instrumentality of men acted upon according to the laws of their own nature. This has required the distinction of SUGGESTION, the direct revelation of things otherwise unknown; ELEVATION, providing for the due preparation of the instruments; and SUPERINTENDENT, as guarding the processes from the intrusion of error. The second of these is by many, naturally enough, thought

superfluous. The Inspiration is PLENARY, as making the Holy Spirit responsible for the truth of all the matter; but not VERBAL, as if He dictated the very words, which in some cases are lost with the autographs of Scripture. Those who reject all such theories of distinction are wont to attribute them to the influence of Maimonides: but unjustly, for they are held by some of the most eminent and orthodox writers on the subject in all churches; and in some form must be accepted by every dispassionate student as nowhere contradicted by Scripture.

2. This view of the co-ordination of the Divine and Human undoubtedly lies at the foundation of the true doctrine; but its dogmatic definition is difficult and as dangerous as difficult.

(1.) The least error here leads to an annihilation of the essential distinction between the action of the Spirit of God on Apostles and Prophets and His general influence in purifying the regenerate faculties for the apprehension of truth. The notion of an analogy between this unity of Divine and human and the Divine and human nature in Christ is liable to the same errors which have beset the doctrine of our Lord's own Person. The Divine element has been and is still by many carried to an extreme in the view of inspiration that makes the human faculties absolutely passive: the Eutychian perversion, so to speak, according to which there is no humanity or human agency left. This has been sufficiently referred to, and is indeed self-convicted. But the reaction is more important in its consequences: the Nestorian perversion, on the other hand, which assigns to the human element such a distinctness and such an ascendancy as leaves no room for a distinct, inspiring influence of the Holy Ghost.

(2.) Schleiermacher has given the tone to much modern English thought on this and other subjects. Coleridge, Morell, Maurice, and others regard the inspiring energy as only the impartation of clear intuitions of spiritual truth by extraordinary means: namely, the raising of the faculties of the mind to a higher potency of what all good men possess. Their notion makes inspiration simply a sympathy with the revealing mind of Christ, the Apostles having had it only in a higher degree than ourselves. The apostrophe of Moses, Enviest thou for my sake? would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put His Spirit upon them! 1 loses its meaning. There is on this assumption no special prerogative of inspiration: all believers are inspired according to the measure of their union with the Lord. If the mechanical theory swallowed up the men in the Inspirer this loses the Inspirer in the men: both errors are equally to be avoided.

1 Numbers 11:29.

(3.) Again, great numbers of orthodox theologians follow Rothe, Martensen, and others, in regarding each writer as contributing his independent portion of what is perfect truth only when the aggregate is received. However much this principle may be condemned in the form it commonly assumes, there is in it much truth. The Bible is one organic whole.

Truth is in every part; the whole truth, however, is only in the complete Bible. The writers of the Old Testament were inspired in anticipation of the New; and the writers of the New Testament were inspired to supplement the Old. The Synoptic Evangelists do not give the full mind of the Spirit as to the Person of Christ; but St. John's presentation of it requires theirs as a background. So, descending into details, every writer in the New Testament adds some fruit of inspiration which is not found in any other. There is hardly a recorded event in the Lord's life which is not transmitted by the Holy Ghost with various shades of difference in the several Evangelists, and to be

understood fully only when the different recorders are collected. But it is obvious that all this touches the results of inspiration, and not inspiration itself.

(4.) There is a strong disposition to unite two things which are incompatible: the belief in an Inspiring Spirit responsible for all spiritual truth with the hypothesis that the human element is liable to all the common infirmities of human composition. When the analogy of our Lord's one Person in two natures is pressed into the service of this theory, it ought not to be forgotten that the human nature of our Lord was sinless and incapable of sin. If its upholders allow that the human element in the Bible is unsusceptible of real error, however affected by infirmity, their doctrine may be made safe, and, if safe, it is deeply interesting and instructive. But that is not generally the view of those to whom we refer.

They would indeed limit the possible incorrectness of our present form of Scripture to things entirely unconnected with faith; and account for it in various ways. Some of these methods are consistent with the dignity of the Word of God: they are such as have been hinted at already. Others are vain and needless devices, and surrender the principle of inspiration to vagueness and uncertainty.

THEAPOLOGYOF INSPIRATION.

Modern assaults on the inspiration of Scripture are of two kinds: they either deny its possibility on abstract grounds, as they deny the possibility of revelation generally, or they seek to resist the evidences of its inspiration as a concrete book.

PHILOSOPHY AND NATURALISM.

1. Spinoza, in the seventeenth century, united the two methods of attack. He rejected, on Pantheistic principles, the idea of any independent action of God, and was the first in later times to accumulate objections against the dogma derived from the text itself. He has not been followed by many in his extreme Pantheism; but Deism in England, and Rationalism or Illuminism in Germany and France, joined with Pantheistic philosophy in refusing to admit any Divine inspiration which should supplement the religion of nature as based on the intuitional consciousness of the human mind and its inherent perception of truth. But the defense of revelation generally is the defense of the method of imparting it. The possibility of inspiration consistently denied by Pantheism is inconsistently denied by Deism; for, with the assumption of a personal God Who is not transcendent but reveals Himself, all their arguments fall. Apart, however, from such denials of revelation generally, this specific doctrine is philosophically opposed by many on psychological grounds. The views of Schleiermacher, and many who echo him, have already been referred to as introducing a false notion of the doctrine. They do in fact really lead to a denial of it altogether. It is thought that religious knowledge, like all knowledge, is only the intuitional consciousness gazing upon realities; and, therefore, that it is unphilosophical to distinguish between the inspiration of the writers of Scripture and the general Christian consciousness. But this notion undermines the foundations of a supernatural disclosure of the mind of God to man. Some seek to make a compromise.

They think, with Coleridge, that in old time God did super-naturally communicate to men knowledge by the Law and the Prophets; but that in these latter and freer days He makes common His revelations through the grace of enlightenment given to all. Hence, so far as the Christian

revelation is concerned, there is no infallible authority beyond the testimonies of fallible consciousness. The more thoroughly the objections to a specific influence on the mind from without are considered, the more baseless will they appear.

One human spirit can influence, and, as it were, inspire another. But here we have to do with the Creator of the human spirit, "Who can not only move upon it but lodge His truth within it. There is literally no philosophical argument of any value against the Christian doctrine of a special inspiring influence of the Holy Ghost.

INTERNAL DIFFICULTIES AND DISCREPANCIES. From very early times the industry of skepticism has been busy with the internal inconsistencies of Scripture, of which a very formidable list has been made out. Infidels early learned to use this weapon: it did not escape them that the Biblical library abounds, literally abounds, with the materials for their task; the enemies of the Bible they have thought to find in its own household. But it will be seen by the student who gives the records of revelation the advantage of being supposed consistent, unless positive proof of inconsistency is found, that there are only such difficulties in the Scriptures as might be expected in such a book, written as it was written, and for the disciplinary, educational purpose which it has in view. Very much is done in the way of answering objections thus urged by simply analyzing them. Such an analysis, however, to be of any value must be complete; and the examination it requires belongs to the departments of Biblical Introduction and Hermeneutics. All that is possible in our dogmatic system is to indicate some general principles that must be remembered in conducting it, and to point out the bearing of the question on our present doctrine.

1. Many discrepancies are, or at least may be, the result of copying and translation. We have not the Originals; there is not a solitary autograph of Prophet or Apostle extant; and many errors of transcription may be admitted, and indeed must be admitted, by every candid student of the text: the inspiring Spirit has watched over the vicissitudes incident to the transmission of human literature without superseding them. The consideration of this question, however, belongs to Biblical Criticism. It is enough here to say, that there are few portions of Holy Scripture of which we can be sure that they lie before us precisely as they left the hand of the first writers. The process of copying the Hebrew of the Old Testament was peculiarly liable to danger: from the similarity of the letters, generally, and specifically from the ancient habit of representing numbers by letters of the alphabet, the difference between units and hundreds and thousands being marked by the addition of points to the units. This is a fact generally conceded. Dr. Kennicott says, " That the Jewish transcribers did frequently express the Bible numbers in the original by single letters is well known to the learned." And Winer: "In expressing numbers, the Jews, in the period after the Captivity, employed the letters of the alphabet, as is evident from the inscriptions of the so-called Samaritan coins; and it is not improbable that the Old Hebrews did the same, just as the Greeks, who derived their alphabet from the Phoenicians, from the earliest ages expressed their numbers by letters. From the confounding of similarly shaped letters when used for numerals, and from the subsequent writing out the same in words, can be explained satisfactorily in part the enormous sums in the Old-Testament books, and the contradictions in their statement of numbers; yet caution is necessary here." A very large number of the contradictory historical statements detected by comparing the Chronicles with the Kings, and Ezra with Nehemiah, and the Genealogical Tables one with another, may fairly be thus explained. Nor should any weight be attached to these, though numbered by hundreds: each of them must be carefully sifted, and the result will

generally be satisfactory. When it is not so, we are bound to believe that errors have crept in through the operation of causes that we cannot now trace. For instance, we read in one account that the molten sea contained two thousand baths; 1 in another, and it received and held three thousand baths. 2 Now here we have an instance that may stand for many. Either 2, 2000, has been confounded with 3, 3000—the more probable solution—or the words received and held suggest that it was capable of containing the larger number. This is the first example that occurs: nothing but want of space prevents reference to many others. In this case we need not absolutely resort to a corruption of the text; but there are others in which there is no other hypothesis open. When we read seven hundred horsemen in one account 3 and seven thousand horsemen 4 in another, we must suppose that shaanaah, has been miswritten for eleph, an easy mistake. In multitudes of texts we must accept such errors; steadfastly believing, however, that they are thus to be accounted for. And that, because we are equally bound to believe that the Scriptures of the Old Testament which St. Paul calls the Oracles of God 5 were originally written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. The New Testament has not been shielded from the errors of transcription: mistakes sometimes arising from carelessness, sometimes from design, but in neither case obviated by any continuous miracle. In the New Testament we have some early manuscripts that supply a standard of judgment; but it cannot be absolutely asserted that there are not errors now appearing even in all of them; and one or two seeming misstatements in historical allusion may be among the number. Here the only question that concerns us is, not how to reconcile inspiration with error in the Bible, but inspiration with a Bible liable to corruption in the text. That is a question not hard of solution. It is enough to the believer to accept the fact, and to admit all its consequences into his theory of inspiration. The holy men who wrote these books were inspired; but their inspiration left no protective virtue in these documents themselves. All we can say is, that it has not pleased God to bind up His eternal truth absolutely and inseparably for good and evil with documents that perish in the using. The truth of the Bible is not staked upon the truth of every sentence that may be found in our copies of it. Meanwhile, it may be affirmed, on the other hand, that so far as concerns that Word of God which liveth and abideth forever, 6 no corruptions of the written text have been suffered to interfere with its perfect presentation. Not one of all the multitude of various readings in the margins of both Testaments affects in the slightest degree the foundation of the doctrine on which man’s salvation depends.

1 1 Kings 7:26; 2 2 Chronicles 4:5; 3 2 Samuel 8:4; 4 1 Chronicles 18:4; 5 Romans 3:2; 6 1 Peter 1:23.

2. Many of the arguments urged against the inspiration of Scripture are really directed against a false or exaggerated notion of its verbal character, and consequently fall away before a freer theory. That many words and sentences were given or suggested to the writers cannot be doubted by anyone who considers the solemn importance of some of the leading terms of Scripture. But to assert that every word was put into the mind of every writer on every subject is to lay on our doctrine a burden too heavy to be borne. It is hard to suppose that the very words in that case would not have been protected forever. And such inspiration would have been too mechanical to harmonies with the obvious and undeniable range given to the human faculties. But the chief point is that this notion furnishes ground of opposition which it is difficult to resist. Very many instances occur in the Gospels of variation in the reports of our Lord’s words, on the most solemn occasions, which in no case affect their sacred spirit and eternal meaning, but are absolutely incompatible

with verbal inspiration. Our Lord could not have spoken the several exact words placed in His lips: what they severally mean He did speak. To take only one example, and that of the highest possible solemnity, we read the following accounts.

Drink ye all of it; for this is My blood of the covenant, which is shed for (peri) many, for remission of sins. 1 Again: This is My blood of the covenant, which is shed for (uper) many. 2 Again: This cup is the new covenant in My blood, which is shed for (uper) you. 3 Once more: This cup is the new covenant in My blood. This do, as oft as ye drink, in remembrance of Me. 4 Not to speak of variations in the historical scenery of the first institution of the Lord's Supper, transpositions, derangements, and omissions, there is evidence here that much is left to the human instrument, and that the thing signified is alone supreme. But there is no evidence in this, or in the multitude of cases of which this is an example, against the fact of the plenary inspiration and absolute authority of the records. The three recorders and St. Paul—who here supplements the Evangelists even as he supplemented the Apostolic company—issued their authoritative accounts from the selfsame Spirit, dividing to each severally as He would.

1 Matthew 26:28; 2 Mark 14:24; 3 Luke 22:21; 4 1 Corinthians 11:25.

3. Objections urged against the inspiration of Scripture on the ground of its science, its religious doctrine, its miraculous element, its ethics, and generally its inconsistency with itself or with the preconceived notions of men, are on the whole easily met. The Holy Ghost never delivers to man as science what science contradicts: to human science as such the Bible does not profess to contribute anything. Strong in our conviction that this book, or library of books, is the record of that Providential government for the sake of which the world exists, we may be sure that it will not be contradicted in fundamental points by anything that the records of nature, or the authentic annals of history, will disclose. There are unsearchable mysteries in the field of science as there are in the field of revelation: it is our wisdom to submit to them in both, waiting for the final reconciliation. But on this subject enough has been said elsewhere. As to the long array of doctrinal objections, they are literally not to be heard as against inspiration. The teaching of the Bible, as a whole, is absolutely self-consistent, supposing the idea of development to be introduced: admitting that idea, the gradual evolution of truth as to God and as to man, and as to the Incarnation uniting God and man, is precisely at all points worthy of the controlling Spirit, and such as only the controlling Spirit could have conducted. Particular instances of discord, as for instance between St. Paul and St. James, are in every single case such as a superficial glance discovers and a deeper meditation explains. There is much more force in the allegation that the ethical principles of the Scripture are not equable and uniform. But here also nothing but a calm investigation will do justice to all the elements of the question. Everywhere in the composition of the Bible the human element largely remains. As men are used as witnesses giving their testimony according to their best lights—true as testimony, but stating what the Spirit may use other witnesses to supplement—so human passions enter without receiving Divine approval. The human documents and human compositions are sometimes quoted, without express Divine approval of their spirit or confirmation of their statements. There are many anomalies and difficulties which will never be cleared up, it may be, because we have lost the key to their solution: certain it is, that many of the stumbling-blocks of modern criticism gave no trouble to the early Church, better informed than we are. It is equally certain that many supposed flaws in the Bible which are regarded as negativing its plenary inspiration disappear before profound investigation; and that many of them are flaws only when

regarded in the light of a false theory of the doctrine. Men of God in both economies have all their faults described; and sometimes those faults are taken up into the order of Providence; but in no solitary instance is there any doubt about the fact that the Holy God loveth righteousness. Everyone allows that the Scriptures, as a whole, have one end, the establishment of holiness in man: then this admission should bar the possibility of misinterpreting passages that might seem to look the other way. That there are minor collisions in the ethics is certain; but we must remember that in every such case there is a reason given. But the heaviest impeachment leaves all else behind and attacks the conduct of God Himself in His dealing with sinful men. Now this is a question of Theodicy and not of inspiration. The Bible does reveal a wrath of God displayed in most mysterious ways in the present world; and foretells its display in the world to come. We see enough around to make us hesitate about refusing acceptance to the strange events recorded in Scripture, where miracle is one of the present powers of the world. But, in any case, they are no argument against the inspiration of Holy Writ as such: what force these apparent anomalies in the Divine conduct have is on the side of Atheism.

4. It must always be remembered that the Bible is a book adapted to man’s probationary estate. Our probation is conducted in a world of the mysteries of which we know but little. The world of revelation has also its unsolved secrets. We know, indeed, much about the fabric of Scripture; but there is much concealed from us. The Holy Ghost never defines inspiration as applied to the whole body of Scripture. We have to construct our theory from the facts; and our theory must take those indisputable facts as it finds them. As a whole, the Bible shines upon the spirit of man as the sun in the firmament: not less clear, not less self-evidencing. The difficulties are for the trial of our faith, our diligence, our humility; and for the exercise of our souls in dependence, not upon the letter but upon the spirit. As Bishop Butler says: "We are wholly ignorant what degree of new knowledge it were to be expected God would give mankind by revelation, upon supposition of His affording one, or how far, or in what way, He would interpose miraculously to qualify them, to whom He should originally make the revelation, for communicating the knowledge given by it; and to secure its being transmitted to posterity." 5. Lastly, there is a high ground to be taken by a believer in the Christian revelation, that is by one who trusts in Jesus, which being taken must not be left for a moment. To this we have referred again and again: it is the conclusion of the whole matter. He came up out of the Old Testament with the Old Testament in His hand: and made the voices of Moses and the ancient prophets His own voice. Long after the representatives of the old economy vanished on the Mount, leaving Him alone Whom all must hear, He expressly summed up their testimony as borne to Himself from first to last: beginning at Moses and at all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself. 1 He made no exception, and no reservation. The framework of our living Savior is the Holy Bible: He is set in it. The believer in Christ, the eternal Oracle of God, receives the Scriptures from His hands as clothed with a Divine authority; if it were not so, if the Divine unction failed to descend upon any part of them, He would have told us.

He has no doubt; he must have no doubt, that the inspiring Spirit has deposited in the Church a true testimony of the history of redemption. Whilst the attack and the defense are going on, it is his wisdom to wait in tranquil confidence. He must not take alarm, and capitulate. He must not abandon the outworks, nor intrench himself in the supposed Bible within the Bible, in the supposed Spirit in the letter. He must not do this, because the Christian revelation is bound up with its Two

Testaments; and he may be sure that the Holy Ghost will support him and honor him in his fidelity to the Records of his Faith.

1 Luke 24:27.

06. Vol 01 - The Canon: The Divine Rule of Faith

The Canon: The Divine Rule of Faith THE CANON: The Divine Rule of Faith THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE

SCRIPTURAL Old Testament Ratified in New

NEW TESTAMENT

HISTORICAL Earlier and Later History of Canon ASSAULTS AND EVIDENCES THE RULE OF FAITH OBJECTIVE STANDARD OF DOCTRINE AND MORALS AND PRIVILEGES RATIONALISM AND TRADITIONALISM SUBJECTIVE CANON BIBLICAL CRITICISM FABRIC OF THE BIBLE:

Introduction, History

PHILOLOGY

HERMENEUTICS EXEGESIS AND THEOLOGY

Having considered the Faith as the revelation of God in Christ accepted by man, and the Divinity of its records as insured by their inspiration, it remains that we complete the discussion of the subject by making prominent the specific character of the Bible as the Canon or authoritative Rule of Christian doctrine and practice. Two different uses of the term will suggest a division. Objectively, the body of sacred writings was determined, under the guidance of the Divine Spirit, by the application of a Canon, or rule, to which they were found to be conformed: here we shall have the Canonical Scriptures.

Subjectively, under the illumination of the same Spirit, these tested Scriptures became the absolute and final standard within the Christian Church: here we shall have to consider The Rule of Faith and its interpretation as a Sacred Text. The word kanónos, signifies literally a straight rod; and metaphorically a testing rule or the organ of the critical faculty in ethics, or art, or language. It is also, in a passive sense, used to denote that which has been measured and determined. St. Paul applies the term both actively and passively in the only passages where it occurs in the New Testament. 1 In the Patristic writings it is employed with reference to the Rule of the Church, the Rule of Faith, and the Rule of Truth; and the decisions of synods were called Canons. The derivatives of Canon were applied to the Scriptures before the term itself: they were Canonized Books, Libri Canonizati. Amphilochius, in a catalogue of the Scriptures (cir. 380), first adopted the word to signify the rule, or criterion, or standard, by which the contents of the Bible must be settled. From the time of Jerome it has been current and established in both senses, the one dependent on the other.

1 Galatians 6:16; 2 Corinthians 10:13-16. THE CANON. The objective Canon is the collection of all the sacred writings of the two dispensations. The Christian Church received the Canon of the Old Testament in its integrity from the Jewish, and that of the New from the Apostles, the Savior’s

authority being the guarantee of both. It will be necessary first to establish these points by Scripture itself, and then to review the history of the formation of the entire Canon: examining briefly the subsequent variations of opinion as to its exact limits: both, however, only so far as they affect the Christian Rule of Faith.

SCRIPTURAL The Canon of the Old Testament is ratified in the New, as containing the infallible and sufficient Oracles of God for the older dispensation: thus the Hebrew Scriptures, precisely as we now receive and hold them, are authenticated, and the so-called Apocryphal books are excluded. The collection of writings now called the New Testament also give indications of what might naturally be expected, that they would in due time constitute a new and supplementary Canon consummating the former.

THEOLD-TESTAMENTCANON.

We have the fullest assurance that the Old Testament, as we hold it, was accepted by our Lord. He refers to the ancient distinction of The Law, Towraah, containing the Pentateuch: The Prophets, Nabiy; and The Writings or The Psalms, zamiyr, the Hagiographa. The demarcations of these three departments were not precisely defined; but sufficiently to identify our present Hebrew volume as the same which Jesus had in His Land and bade His disciples' study. The importance of such a supreme testimony cannot be exaggerated: it may be placed, and sometimes we must place it, in the stead of many other arguments.

1. This testimony excludes the apocryphal books: the three-fold arrangement is, in fact, recognized and admitted by some of these writings themselves, which shows that they were avowedly excluded from the Canon. The term APOCRYPHA came into use in the second Christian century, to designate books of hidden origin (occulta origo), or perhaps secret authority (secreta auctoritas); and certainly with the further meaning of spurious and heretical in opposition to the accepted writings of the Church. Whatever was the precise application of the plain Greek word, it implied an absolute authority in the collection from which they were excluded, and the reason for their exclusion. The New Testament never quotes or alludes to these books. It may be said that this is not a decisive argument, as several books of the Old Testament are equally unrecognized: but it must be remembered that when the Law, or the Prophets, or the Psalms are quoted, all is authenticated that these conventional divisions were known to include. It may be urged also that the Lord does not, any more than His Apostles, specify the exact number of books contained in these divisions: especially in the last, which was the most undetermined. But we have the sufficient evidence of contemporary Hebrews to supply that deficiency.

Josephus says: " We have only twenty-two books which are to be trusted as having Divine authority, of which five are the books of Moses. From his death to the reign of Artaxerxes, king of Persia, the prophets, who were the successors of Moses, have written in thirteen books. The remaining 'four contain hymns to God, and documents of life for human edification." But thus we arc led to the next point.

2. This division seems to set its seal on the means by which the Old-Testament Canon had been arranged and ratified. Our Lord assumed, what St. Paul expressed, that to the Jews, as a people, were committed the oracles of God. By accepting these Scriptures, with their extant divisions, He silently confirmed a long history, most of the details of which are lost. It is evident in the current of

Biblical history that there had been a gradual collection from the beginning. The Book of the Law was deposited in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord. 1 This original was to be copied by every future king: and it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life. 2 Nevertheless, Josiah had not seen it when Hilkiah the high priest said unto Shaphan the scribe, I have found the book of the law in the house of the Lord; 3 though we know not in how many hands copies might have been found. For it had been enlarged by other writings, and autographs may have been circulated by Joshua, of whom it is said that he wrote these words in the book of the law of God, 4 and Samuel, who told the people the manner of the kingdom, and wrote it in a book, and laid it up before the Lord. 5 Hence Jehoshaphat sent out his Levites who taught in Judah, and had the look of the law of the Lord with them, and went about throughout all the cities of Judah, and taught the people. 6 Proverbs also were collected; as we read of the proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Hezekiah, king of Judah, copied out. 7 One general Book seems to have been authoritative, of which the prophet spoke, Seek ye out of the book of the Lord and read. 8 But, until the Captivity, there was no distinction in the classes of writings. It was one volume that Daniel quoted, and Ezra and Nehemiah read before the people from morning until mid-day. 9 When the Jewish polity was reorganized there was a final revision. The universal tradition of the ancient Church assigned to Ezra, and the Great Synagogue, the function of arranging their Scriptures in their present form; the persecution of Antiochus, and the proscription of the sacred books, having given occasion to the fixing of the Canon. This question, however, must be studied in its appropriate literature. It may be admitted that the supposed Synagogue of Jewish tradition represents a succession of pious men from Ezra to Simon the Just, who was high priest after the death of Alexander the Great. The final revision and collection was not, on this supposition, finished in the time of Ezra. But the Savior’s authority gives a retrospective sanction to the final authentication, however it was accomplished.

1 Deuteronomy 31:26; 2 Deuteronomy 17:19; 3 2 Kings 22:8; 4 Joshua 24:26; 5 1 Samuel 10:25; 6 2 Chronicles 17:9; 7 Proverbs 25:1; 8 Isaiah 34:16; 9 Nehemiah 8:3.

THENEW-TESTAMENTCANON.

There is no plain declaration in the New Testament that the ancient Canon was to be supplemented by another collection of books: not only is there no plain declaration, but an almost total silence on the subject. When we remember how often the Old Testament refers to the Volume which was, from age to age, in course of enlargement, it seems an anomaly that there should be no similar reference in the New. We read of the Word of truth: 1 of the truth as truth is in Jesus; 2 of the new or better Covenant; 3 never of new Scriptures, certainly never of a new volume or collection Heb. of inspired documents. But there are not wanting indications, to which reference has already been made under the Doctrine of Inspiration, that the design of the Holy Ghost included the formation of a new Canon.

1 Ephesians 1:13; 2 Ephesians 4:21; 3 Hebrews 8:8.

1. Though the several terms by which the New-Testament Testimony writers were accustomed to describe their enlarged message do not expressly refer to a new Bible, they are such as to lay the foundation for it in due time. And it is certain that the individual writings of the Apostles were held in the congregations which received them to have equal authority with the ancient and accepted Oracles of God, and that the Catholic Church addressed by St. Peter reckoned St. Paul’s writings

as co-ordinate with the other Scriptures. 1 It is remarkable, further, that almost every writer gives somewhere or other a distant hint, and even more than that, of the permanent authority of his own contribution. This needs no further illustration than it has received already. Looking back now, after the Canon has been ratified, we are bound to admit that these sayings are precisely what they might be expected to have used on the supposition that they calculated on their writings being consolidated into the unity of Scripture.

1 2 Peter 3:16.

2. No argument, however, is needed beyond that of analogy. A new covenant would require new oracles; the entire economy of the New Testament was only a resumption and continuation of the ancient plan. Christ came to fulfill the Law and the prophets, and to fulfill them by supplementing both their words and their writings. He Himself was in the new economy what He had been in the Old: the universal and omnipresent Revealer by His Spirit in His servants, the Spirit of the Christ, which was in them. 1 But He raised up a series of agents and writers who were the representatives and reproductions of those who formed the Old Testament, though with other names. They were Chroniclers, Prophets, and Lawgivers, just as of old time. There is a perfect continuity in the history of revealed truth; had its method been changed in the end of the world, the Savior would have told us of the change. The silence of the New Testament, or its partial silence, as to any change of the Holy Spirit's plan, has the force of a confirmation of the established method. As in old time the volume of the book was gradually enlarged, and not finally ratified until inspiration had ceased, so we might expect it to be with the new economy. The New-Testament Scriptures were circulated among the churches as the standard of their faith long, before the Spirit led the Church to set on them the seal of what we call canonization: to them, as to the Old Testament, all parties, orthodox and heretical, made their appeal.

1 1 Peter 1:11.

HISTORICAL. The history of the completed Canon includes its gradual settlement during the first centuries, and the fluctuations of opinion in later ages. A fair consideration of these two subjects will lead to the conclusion that the same Spirit Who gave the Scriptures has watched over them, and secured their integrity. The formation of the Canon runs through the entire ante-Nicene age. The fourth century closed before the faith and critical faculty of the Christian communities added our present New Testament in its integrity to the Old, the last lingering doubt as to any of the books having finally disappeared.

1. The first thing to be noted is the prerogative of the Church in regard to this. The Apostle tells us that unto the ancient people as such were committed the oracles of God: 1 a distinct testimony of great importance, if we mark the force of the term episteútheesan, and the Proóton, which introduces the sentence. There was a close analogy between the gradual acceptance of the new body of Scripture and that of the old. The ancient Canon was not fixed until the Spirit of inspiration had retired; it was the office of the Jewish Fathers to distinguish between the authoritative books and all others; the tests by which they determined the difference were, so far as we know them, the names and known inspiration of the writers, and the traditional consent of past ages. The final ratification was brought about by the pressure of persecution directed against the sacred writings; but there ought to be no doubt that this was under the special supervision of the Holy Ghost. The parallel is so far complete. But there were some peculiarities in the case of the new collection. The

Gospel was diffused over the world, and every church was the guardian of its own holy books, while every province of early Christendom had its own special selection of Scriptures; there were also numberless heresies, multiplying their spurious productions. These two circumstances tended to make the concurrence of the Christian Church in the final acceptance of the New-Testament writings a more remarkable fact than the unanimity of the Jewish Church in regard to the Old Testament. When the set time was fully come the same Spirit who closed the Old-Testament volume closed also the New.

1 Romans 3:2.

2. The tests applied to the books circulated among the Christian congregations were very simple. The main criterion was their apostolic origin or authorization, that being the guarantee of their inspired character. In case of residual doubt, the common Regula Fidei, or rule of faith, was brought to bear, as also the testimony of the churches that held the several documents in question. It was the sure belief of the primitive Christians that the Lord gave to the Apostles alone authority to direct the faith of His Church, both by their words and by their written communications. Apostolic authorship or Apostolic authorization was all they demanded in the sacred writings: they looked simply for the signs of an Apostle, Tá mén seemeía toú apostólou. 1 Hence the writings of St. Mark and St. Luke were never even classed among the doubtful books: they were understood to have been written under the sanction of St. Peter and St. Paul. Of the genuineness of those which claimed to be directly Apostolic, and of the validity of such as claimed indirect sanction, their harmony with the common Rule of Faith, and the testimony of the individual churches, were subordinate and sufficient tests.

1 2 Corinthians 12:12.

3. The result was the early division of the sacred books into two classes: those which were universally acknowledged as Divinely inspired, and those which were not at first generally received. The former, the HOMOLOGOUMENA, were, before the second century closed, the four Gospels and Acts, thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, the first Epistle of St. Peter, and the first Epistle of St. John. The ANTILEGOMENA were seven: not, indeed, rejected, but doubted about, and not at once received. The reasons for this suspended judgment are evident. Some were without the names of the writers, such as the Epistle to the Hebrews. Some were written to the Christian community in general, and were current at large, under the protection of no particular church. Others were addressed to individual men, and on that account incurred suspicion. A few were opposed to the views of some portions of the Church: such as the Apocalypse and the Epistle of St. James. It must be remembered that they were not spoken against, as the term Antilegomena might seem to indicate, but held in doubt only. In later times they have been termed DEUTEROCANONICAL, their authority being counted less than that of the other books.

4. There were a few small treatises that were very generally received in early times with a peculiar veneration: written, it was thought, by Apostolical men, or companions of the Apostles, such as Clemens Romanus, Barnabas, and Hernias. They were publicly read in some churches, and were copied into the earliest Codices, where they are still found, though only as appendages at the end. Their pretensions did not long survive the jealous ordeal.

5. In an altogether different class must be placed the many writings that make up the APOCRYPHAL Christian Books. Some of these were written in the interests of a Judaising Christianity, others with a precisely opposite tendency, and the remainder for the gratification of legend-loving curiosity. There were apocryphal gospels, acts, epistles, and apocalypses; but not one of them was ever found in any private or public catalogue of the sacred writings. It may be added that the apocryphal shadows of the New Testament are far inferior in ethical character to those of the Old, some of which are of the highest merit. The former, in fact, are either worthless or utterly unchristian.

6. Successive synodical decisions approximated more and more closely to the catalogue of holy books which we hold. They culminated at the Council of Hippo, and, four years afterwards, at the Third Council of Carthage, then under the influence of Augustine, in the Canon of the present New Testament. The persecution of Diocletian, in the beginning of the fourth century, led to the more careful scrutiny of what had, during the whole of the century previous, been called the " Evangelicum Instrumentum;" a term used by Tertullian, who also described the whole Bible as "Totum Instrumentum utriusque Testament." Only the pressing claims of other doctrinal discussions and decisions prevented the Council of Nicaea from accomplishing what was already virtually done: the task, that is, of defining the authoritative Canon of Holy Scripture.

7. The Old-Testament Canon was accepted and confirmed, as we now hold it, by many catalogues in the fourth and fifth centuries. The Alexandrian Church, represented by Athanasius, gives exactly our list of books: a remarkable fact, when we remember that the Greek version made in Alexandria had first given currency to the Apocrypha. But the study of Hebrew had declined: the Christian Church was contented with the Septuagint, enlarged as it was by apocryphal additions. The Hebrew Scriptures were too much left to the Masorites. Hence the New-Testament Canon was earlier and more unanimously settled in Christian faith and acceptance than the Old: even the Council of Carthage admitted, though with reservation, the Old-Testament Apocrypha.

LATER HISTORY OF THE CANON.

Later opinion as to the Canon may be studied with advantage Modern and for warning. Its outline, which should be filled up by a History. Careful study of the literature of the subject, is as follows: 1. The question of the Canon was long an open one in the mediaeval Church. The Council of Trent, in a decree passed by a Trent, few divines in 1546, followed an example set by the Council of Florence in 1441, and included nearly all the Apocrypha among the books of Scripture: a decree contrary to the former catalogues, which therefore many later Romanist divines have attempted to soften by distinguishing, in common with many of the Reformers, between a higher and a lower canonical authority.

2. The later Greek Church has always fluctuated in opinion on this question. After many attempts to mark off the Apocrypha from the Scripture proper, it coincided with the Tridentine decision at a Jerusalem, Synod held under Dositheus, in 1672.

3. The divines of the Reformation erred greatly on the side of laxity. Luther rejected the apocryphal books from the Canon, though he admitted them for edification. He separated the Antilegomena, especially Hebrews, Jude, James, and the Apocalypse, from the rest: applying to them a subjective standard, "their treatment of Christ," in which he pronounced them faulty; while the

residue contained, in his judgment, " the kernel of Christianity." The Swiss Reformers more rigorously rejected the Apocrypha; and in this they have been followed by their formularies and the Westminster Confession. The Arminians received the Scriptures in full, though free in their judgments as to authorship. The English Church in this, as in many other things, was guided by a spirit of conciliation. Its Sixth Article defines Scripture as "those canonical books of the Old and New Testament of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church;" it does not enumerate the books of the New Testament, and admits the public reading of some parts of the Apocrypha: " the other books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners, but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine." The Methodist communities everywhere reject the Apocrypha altogether, in common with the many bodies that accept the Westminster Confession.

ASSAULTS AND EVIDENCES.

Modern assaults upon the Canon are, to a certain extent, bound up with opposition to the Christian revelation generally; though they also originate a distinct branch of critical inquiry. The determination of what constitutes the canonical collection involves many questions, relating chiefly to the genuineness, integrity, and authenticity of certain particular books; the defense of which is of great importance, as the faith of the Church of Christ rests upon the unity of the Scriptures as one organic whole. THE QUESTIONS INVOLVED.

1. The broader question as to the existence of any authoritative Canon is not here involved. That is settled by the acceptance of the doctrine of inspiration: we are bound to admit the great mass of the Scriptures of both Testaments as given by God to His Church. The question is not of the Bible generally, and as a whole; only of its limits. But both in the New Testament and in the Old there are some books which, as we have seen, have not always had an undisputed place. With reference to these especially, and as to one of the points in dispute with reference to all Scripture, the preliminary question must be asked and answered. First, it must be settled that the documents we hold are from the writers and times to which they profess to belong. This is a question of their GENUINENESS; and it concerns only the documents them-selves. It asks, with regard to all the books, and especially the contested ones, whether they were written by the authors whose names they bear. Then arises the important point of their INTEGRITY: making due allowance, that is, for the petty changes and interpolations of text to which all books are liable in course of transcription. Lastly comes the question of their AUTHENTICITY. This concerns the origin of the documents, as professedly from inspired men, and containing the oracles of God. It asks whether their claims are supported by those external and internal evidences or credentials which alone can sustain so high a pretension. It is obvious that these questions run into each other: hence, the term Authenticity, and the questions which hang upon it, may be reasonably made to cover the whole ground.

2. The study of this branch of theology involves the ordinary historical investigation by which literary claims are sifted.’ But it is not limited to this: the Holy Spirit approves the books which are "generally received in the Church" by the impress of His secret and yet evident stamp. On the principles which we consider fundamental, these two must control each other, but the testimony of Christ and His Spirit must be supreme.

(1.) Whether as it respects the Old Testament or the New, every book and every fragment of every book must undergo the ordeal. This constitutes a distinct department of study, that of Historical

Criticism: one of extreme difficulty, and not to be undertaken by any student who has not the means of prosecuting it thoroughly. Whatever confidence we have in our Lord's authentication of the Old Testament, and in the Church's settlement of the New-Testament Canon, the defense of every integral portion of the Bible is a necessity bound upon the theologian by the assaults of infidelity. It is not too much to say that every man set for the defense of the Gospel ought to have at command. The arguments which prove the genuineness and authenticity of every book; or, which is the same thing, the arguments which defend it against attack. Works known as Introductions to the Bible, or Biblical Dictionaries, or Histories of the Canon, furnish these in abundance, with all the argumentation for and against. But it must be remembered that, while every book requires its defense, the leading questions in dispute are really limited to a few vital points as to each Testament.

(2.) Nothing is more important than to conduct any such inquiries with a clear sense of its limitations. These are of two kinds. First, the inquiry into the genesis and gradual construction of the various pans of Scripture, especially of the Old Testament, is beset with the most formidable difficulties. Very much of the material for judgment is gone past recovery. Hence the hopeless contradictions and confusions, the helpless chaos of ever-shifting hypotheses, which are found in the writings of the modern disintegrators of the Bible. The field is to them literally one of boundless conjecture; and very often conjecture and evidence are to them interchangeable terms. Hence, also, it is evident that the defender of the Bible must not expect to be able to determine many of these questions and must be content to leave them unsettled. Secondly, we are not required, we are indeed not permitted, to engage in these inquiries as if the life of Christianity were in them. The authenticity of the Bible as a whole—which is, after all, inextricably bound up with its genuineness — involves the TESTIMONIUM SPIRITUS SANCTI, or that inward witness which it bears, and which witnesses with our spirits who read any part of it.

Hence, it may be laid down as a canon for the regulation of our confidence in the Canon that the Spirit of Inspiration is Himself the Divine Witness. As our Lord has ratified to us the older Scriptures, so the Holy Ghost has ratified us, in the Church and through the Church, the new Scriptures and the Bible as a whole. Criticism must bring its human evidence; but the supreme evidence is His. When it is said, however, that the Holy Ghost bears His witness to the Bible AS A WHOLE, this must not be misunderstood. He has in a remarkable way set His seal to the individual books, and especially to those which are most contradicted. The most vulnerable parts seem most amply defended. For instance, the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch is very fully attested by the Savior and the Apostles: if we collect the quotations and references in the New Testament we shall find that the leading outlines of the history of the Five Books can be traced there. The events before Moses are referred to on his authority. And his account of the lawgiving, the wilderness, and all its events, the ritual economy of the tabernacle, the entrance into Canaan, and in fact the entire contents of the Pentateuch are accepted as of the Mosaic age and that of Joshua. The authenticity of Daniel has been assailed, the later part of Isaiah has been given to an anonymous author, the very heart of Zechariah has been taken from his prophecies: now these are the three portions of the Old Testament which the Savior has protected, next to Deuteronomy, with the utmost care. Among the books of the New Testament there are a few which criticism keenly assails; denying their apostolic origin and their inspired or authoritative character. It would not be true to say that these give in every case more abundant internal evidence for themselves;

but certainly the Holy Ghost speaks through them to every rightly disposed heart. Who can resist the appeal of St. John's Gospel, the Pastoral Epistles, and the Epistle to the Ephesians, St. James, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Second Epistle of St. Peter? This last document was perhaps most slowly of all admitted, for reasons easily traced; but no devout mind can read its first chapter without feeling that the writer is full of the Holy Ghost and not a forger assuming the Apostle's name, and pretending that he had been on the mount of transfiguration. Of course, this argument may be abused. But to us it is supreme as to the entire Bible which the Spirit gave to the Church. THE CANON ASRULE OF FAITH. The Canon of Scripture, as the accepted collection of sacred writings, may be objectively viewed as the Rule of Faith to the Christian Church, or the final and infallible standard of what is to be believed as necessary either to personal salvation or to the integrity of the Christian faith; and subjectively as a body of Divine documents which is to be studied with all human appliances under the teaching of the Holy Ghost THE RULE OF FAITH: SCRIPTURAL. The plenary inspiration of the Scriptures implies their supreme authority, in every possible court, and at the same time justifies our appealing to their own testimony as to the bearings and extent of that authority. They everywhere speak as the final oracle of faith, duty, and hope, and reject every kind of co-ordinate standard. This high assertion of their claims is so set forth as to harmonies with the subordinate rules of faith or confessions adopted by the several branches of the witnessing Church, and with the exercise of private judgment: the supreme safeguard of the doctrine being the presence of the Holy Spirit as the effectual and sufficient Guardian of His Word.

1. Generally, the New Testament declares itself, as the consummation of Scripture, to be the STANDARD OF FAITH. Absorbing the Old Testament, or rather coordinating itself with the Old Testament, it declares by the testimony of one of the last and greatest writers that Every Scripture inspired of God is also profitable for TEACHING 1. . . that the man of God may be perfect. The man of God is here the Christian teacher, of whom it is said that his knowledge of the ancient oracles made him wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.2 The Apostles were to be guided into all the Truth; 3 into the whole compass of truth, as the truth is in Jesus.4 Hence the closing testimony in St. Jude is to the Faith which was once delivered unto the saints: 5 redelivered by its Supreme Authority to His new and perfect Church. The doctrine of our Lord is the RULE AND CRITERION OF MORALITY, and of all human duty. The Christian faith is the Christian law, and the Christian law is the Christian faith: Christ is the end of the law for righteousness; 6 and His whole economy has for its design that the ordinance of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. 7 He is the Way, and the Truth, and the Life: 8 the truth being here in the centre. He summed up the Apostles' future teaching as all things whatsoever I have commanded you. 9 St. Paul knows no other ethics than what had been received and heard from himself, and bids his converts walk by the same rule, or kanóni, 10, 11 as the infallible directory and test of all obligation. And the book of truth and duty is also the CHARTER OF PRIVILEGES. It was with the widest possible meaning that Jesus said, All things that I have heard of My Father I have made known unto you: 12 the whole compass of the blessings dilated on in the Acts and Epistles is only the expansion of germs given in His promise. The New Testament is the book of the covenants of promise: 13 the new covenant between the Triune God and His people, ratified by the blood of Christ, announced in His promise, and conferred by His Spirit.

1 2 Timothy 3:16-17; 2 2 Timothy 3:15; 3 John 16:13; 4 Ephesians 4:21; 5 Jude 1:3; 6 Romans 10:4; 7 Romans 8:4; 8 John 14:6; 9 Matthew 28:20; 10 Php 3:16; 11 Galatians 6:16; 12 John 15:16; 13 Ephesians 2:12.

2. The Scripture everywhere appeals to itself for an end of all controversy. To the law and to the testimony! 1 was the ancient word in Israel. How then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled that thus it must be? 2 By these words our Savior makes the Scriptures concerning Himself absolute in their authority. Apollos, like the Apostles, proved by the Scriptures that Jesus was Christ. 3 The Bereans were therefore more noble-minded than they of Thessalonica, because they searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things wereSong of Solomon 4:1-16 The peril of neglecting the great salvation hangs upon its having been spoken by the Lord, and confirmed unto us by them that heard Him. 5 There is a perpetual appeal from one part of Scripture to another part of Scripture: sometimes to reason, sometimes to heathen authors, sometimes to traditions; but always the Caesar to which it finally appeals is itself. The Savior refers to the Old Testament; the Apostles to Him and to them, St. Paul, in addition, to himself; and St. Peter to St. Paul. This has the force of a universal law within the Bible. And it cannot be denied that throughout the history of the Church from the very beginning all parties have implicitly or explicitly made the Word of God their last court of decision.

1 Isaiah 8:20; 2 Matthew 26:54; 3 Acts 18:11; 4 Hebrews 2:3.

3. Every other final authority is absolutely or by implication interdicted. Nothing can be more clear than that our Lord regarded the whole sum of religion as vitiated by infidelity to Scripture. In vain they do worship Me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men: 1 where the Pharisees are a mirror in which later traditionalists are reflected. And again, Do ye not therefore err, because ye know not the Scriptures? 2 1 Matthew 15:9; 2 Mark 12:24.

4. The supreme authority sanctions, however, other inferior standards in the form of creeds. Those Rules of Faith which were constructed from the beginning were based upon the formulas of Scripture itself: expressing in compendium the belief of the Church. But of these, in all their forms, earlier and later, the Bible is the test: the court to which they must finally be brought. This applies to creeds, catechisms, standards, and formularies of every description: of which more will be said hereafter.

5. The Rule also presupposes and harmonizes, as subordinate to itself, Public Ministerial Instruction and Private Judgment, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The Scriptures are the textbook of a living continuous teaching which is an ordinance of God in the congregation: this may be and has been perverted; but it is nevertheless the appointed means in the Church for the continuation of the Apostles' doctrine. Moreover, the privilege, duty, and responsibility of private judgment are everywhere declared. The prophecies of God's Word are, indeed, not of private interpretation, 1 are not solved by themselves or any private solution— idías epilúseoos ou gínetai, —and this is true of all Scripture, which is not left without the interpretation of the Spirit Who gave it. Yet all believers must prove all things: 2 not only the Bereans, in process of conversion, but all Christians are responsible for the gift of reason, regenerate and sanctified to its highest use. Both, however, require the presence of the Supreme Interpreter. He still guides the living Church into the truth, notwithstanding all appearances to the contrary; He is the teaching unction from the Holy One 3 imparted to every Christian; and the combination of the three—the

sanctified individual judgment, the didactic ministry, and the Holy Spirit—gives its perfection to the whole theory of the Rule of Faith, which is one in the unity of these three. Revelation, Inspiration, Canon are also three-one in the unity of the ever-present and ever-living Spirit of the Truth. 4 1 2 Peter 1:20; 2 1 Thessalonians 5:21; 3 1 John 2:20; 4 John 16:13.

RATIONALISM AND TRADITIONALISM.

There are two errors on this subject which are more or less prevalent. Rationalism, on the one hand, undermines the authority of God's Word: either by rejecting it as an external revelation, or by accepting it and making human reason the sole arbiter of its meaning.

Traditionalism, on the other, makes the Scripture only a standard parallel with the living tradition of the Church. Both, though in opposite ways, take from the Bible its dignity as the Rule of Christian Faith, and sever it from its connection with the Holy Spirit as it is the supreme instrument of His operation in things spiritual for ever.

RATIONALISM. The Rationalist method either makes human reason the substance of revealed truth, or the measure and arbiter of the meaning of Scripture. For, it is of two kinds: one renounces external and independent revelation altogether; another, that to which we now more particularly refer, accepts the Bible, but only as a republication of the oracles of natural religion, and makes the human understanding the sole, and, as it were, undirected instrument of its interpretation.

1. To the former the Scriptures are simply an historical record and register of the gradual development of the world's religious instincts. Evolution governs all things in the spiritual as in the physical domain; and the Old and New Testaments only mark the stages through which the spiritual faculties of earlier races had passed. In Jesus and His Apostles the religious consciousness of mankind reached a high point, but not the highest which it has to reach. The ever-developing reason of man must make their doctrine, has in all ages made it, the starting point for further evolutions; and the end is not yet. This theory for ever vacillates between Theism and Atheism, and has no place save among the enemies of the Christian Faith. Of this enough has already been said when discussing the evidences of revelation.

2. Rationalism proper accepts the supremacy of the Word as given by God for the regulation of the Church's doctrine, but insists that the human reason is the sole judge of its meaning. This spirit more or less pervades the Christian communities which have surrendered the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the holy oracles. It has many shades and varieties of definition and expression; but these all unite in the view that the application of an honest and enlightened reason is alone required by Scripture when it teaches authoritative doctrine, enforces moral obligation, and promises privilege to the hope of believers.

3. It is obvious that this principle proceeds on a wrong estimate of the function of the human understanding, especially in relation to the Divine Spirit, its guide: supposing a Divine supervision of man to be admitted. It unduly elevates the power of reason, reason itself being witness. It is unreasonable to accept truth concerning the Infinite Being, and eternal interests, under the condition that it can be fathomed and perfectly understood: on this condition some of the most elementary facts of internal consciousness and external science must be rejected, for they are equally unfathomable. Hence, declining to accept heavenly guidance in an unknown region, the rationalist spirit must needs renounce the best, because the profoundest, parts of revelation. It

forgets the true and noble function of reason: to be the minister of faith, which in all things knowable is in a certain important sense supreme. Reason must weigh the evidences presented for faith, and deduce consequences from what faith accepts; it must guard the result from the assaults of the spirit of rebellious and undisciplined unbelief, as well as from the perversions of overbelief and superstition. Carrying the subject into the region of Scriptural testimony, we find that the spirit of what we now call rationalism is constantly condemned. The same Word which from beginning to end honors reason by calmly reasoning with it, by appealing to its indestructible convictions and instincts, is most peremptory in defining the limits beyond which its province does not extend. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.1 d even to the spiritual discernment itself there is a limit: For now we see through a glass, darkly. 2 Our utmost knowledge is partial: in the present life we knoio in part, ek mérous.3 1 1 Corinthians 2:14; 2 1 Corinthians 13:12; 3 1 Corinthians 13:9.

TRADITION. The true doctrine opposes every notion of a co-ordinate authority in Tradition. This has a legitimate office which must be vindicated, while its perversion is condemned.

1. Tradition is paradosis, either oral or written. And it is obvious that it holds an important place in the economy of Divine revelation. St. Paul commands the believers at the outset of his writings to hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle; 1 d not walking by these is walking disorderly. Hence it includes in its original use the delivery of all truth through human instrumentality to man. We owe to it the Scriptures, with that sacred traditional interpretation of their leading doctrines which we call the Analogy of the Faith; and we owe to it the preservation of many usages and practices which are not absolutely ruled in the Bible. Theology has never rejected or despised authentic and rightly understood tradition.

1 2 Thessalonians 2:15; 2 Thessalonians 3:16.

2. But the abuse of Tradition has always been the bane of doctrine, especially of all Christian doctrine. Reduced to an ecclesiastical theory, it has then two elements: Scripture and the oral tradition of the Church constitute a double Rule of Faith; and this necessarily requires as its final arbiter an infallible regulative authority in the Church itself.

(1.) The co-ordinate Rule is that of Oral Tradition, adding doctrines not contained in Scripture; or Development, expanding those revealed in germ. It has never been authoritatively settled what is the " Verbum Dei non scriptum," or what constitute the APOSTOLICAL TRADITIONS; but some of the leading Articles of Faith and practice are generally included. The hypothesis of DEVELOPMENT is only itself a modern development of the theory of Tradition: the principle by the operation of which the great distinctive errors of Romanism have been constructed into Articles DE FIDE and made binding. The "Ecclesia Docens" decides, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, when the hour has come for opinion to become dogma. The infallible Church is the Episcopate lineally descended from the Apostles; the Universal Church expressing its mind by councils; and latterly, as the last development of dogma, the voice of the Successor of St. Peter, speaking " ex cathedra," has been made the final arbiter of truth. This is the doctrine of Tradition as held in the Roman Catholic Church. Modifications of it are held elsewhere. The Eastern Church maintains the Church’s concurrent endowment of inspiration, but supposes that this was limited to the first ages: according to its teaching the double rule, Scripture and Tradition, was complete when its earliest

and only Creed was authenticated. In a vague and indefinite form the same principle is inconsistently held by many divines in communions which owed their origin to a protest against ecclesiastical tradition as unduly paralleled with Scripture.

(2.) This theory loses sight of the true and most important office of Tradition, which is simply the human witness and guardianship of the Divine oracles; it dishonors the prerogative of the inspired writers, and builds, not upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, 1 t on the Church as their interpreter; it assigns-to the visible community the functions of the invisible; it affects the Faith with a character of changeableness, of which the fabric of Mediaeval dogmas gives ample proof; and, lastly, it is the object of our Savior's warning denunciation, as represented in the Rabbinical traditions of His time. The tone and the terms in which our Lord invariably spoke of this superaddition to the one Rule of Faith ought to have secured His Church for ever against it. The Jewish Talmud was constructed on this principle; and there has been in long process of construction a corresponding Christian Talmud. The teachings of the Faith have been in it undergoing a process of steady transformation. The doctrine of the Atonement has been violated in the dogma of Transubstantiation, that of Original Sin in the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, and that of the Spirit's supreme jurisdiction in the dogma of Pontifical Infallibility. This theory, in its modern form of Development, is hurtful to the simplicity and integrity of the truth; the Faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints: teé hápax paradotheísee toís hagíois pístei. 2 thin the ages of the Spirit's inspiring administration there was development on the grandest scale, and extending to all the leading doctrines of revelation: that principle is nothing less than an absolute law. But the province of development outside of the Bible is limited to non-essentials and the construction of dogmatic system: in fact, the term in this case is altogether misapplied.

Only in Scripture is there, strictly speaking, development of doctrine proper.

1 Ephesians 2:20; 2 Jude 1:3.

THEINTERPRETATIONOF THE CANON. The Bible, as the Rule of Faith, is the foundation of theology. It requires to be studied as a collection of documents, both Divine and human, containing the materials and the directory of theological science. The departments of this study are various. Biblical Criticism is that branch of general criticism which makes the determination of the Text its object. The province of Biblical Introduction embraces the substance and contents of the Scriptures as a collection of Divine-human literature. Sacred Philology has to do with the original languages in which revelation was given. Hermeneutics deals with the Bible as a text to be exegetically and theologically expounded. The general principles of these several branches of study must be briefly sketched, as laying the basis of the doctrinal system of Christianity; but they are here referred to so far only as they concern the fundamentals of the study of theology.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM. The term Criticism means the art and exercise of judgment, and has a wide application in regard to Scripture generally. But Biblical Criticism does not extend its range beyond the judgment exercised upon the verity of the text. Its aim is to give or restore the nearest possible approximation to the original words of the Scriptural Autographs, not one of which remains or has been the subject of direct historical testimony. In accomplishing this object Criticism is guided by certain objective aids and subjective canons more or less unanimously accepted.

1. Its external materials are the Manuscripts which remain and the earlier Versions, especially the former. The MSS. of the Old Testament are not ancient, dating no earlier than the twelfth century. The criticism of the Hebrew text is therefore limited in its scope; it has to depend much upon the early care of those to whom these Oracles were committed. But it has still a wide range, and has made great progress of late. The MSS. of the Greek Testament are more abundant, better authenticated, and in more perfect preservation than those of any ancient classics: including the Uncial, copies in Greek capital letters, and the Cursives in smaller type, they amount to nearly sixteen hundred. The earliest of these are Uncials, and are of inestimable value in the archives of the Christian Church as the most venerable representatives of its holy books. The Alexandrian Codex, known as A, and now in the British Museum, dates probably about the beginning of the fifth century, and contains the whole of the Two Testaments, save the greater part of St. Matthew and a few leaves wanting elsewhere. The Vatican, or B, is the basis of the Vulgate, authoritative in Romanism; it is a century older than A, but is not so nearly complete in the New Testament. The Codex Ephraemi, or C, is a Palimpsest—that is, a manuscript written on a manuscript: two-thirds of the New Testament have been found underlying certain other writings on this parchment. The Codex Bezae, D, now at Cambridge, is probably of the sixth century, and contains only the Gospels and Acts. But Divine Providence has reserved for this age the discovery of an Uncial which is probably one of the oldest, certainly the most complete, of the early copies of Scripture. It is known as the Codex Sinaiticus, or Alef, and contains the complete New Testament. After these the Manuscripts, in the form of more or less complete copies used in various churches and of lectionaries, rapidly increase. Multitudes of these are lineally descended, as it were, from copies made in the first centuries but now lost; and it always remains a question whether they are not in many cases as fair representatives of the early text as those Uncials of antiquity which still remain. The tendency has been entirely to disparage them in comparison of the earliest Codices; but for this there seems no just ground. The early Versions are of great importance in Criticism. The Septuagint of the Old Testament is, on many accounts, the most important, as being so much used in the New Testament; but it is not the only one. Each century from the second to the seventh produced a remarkable version of the New Testament, appeal to which, especially to the Peshito, or Syriac, of the fourth century, affords valuable aid in the determination of the Text. The innumerable Quotations found in the Fathers of the first five centuries belong also to this branch, as they are very often free translations, or loose paraphrases of translations.

2. These manuscripts multiplied, and, more or less sinking in authority as centuries passed, are collated and thrown into Families or Recensions, according to the leading districts of early Christendom from which they sprang: a distinction, however, that has more historical than critical importance. Biblical Critics, by the use of certain canons the application of which requires the rarest judgment and experience, seek by their aid mainly to restore the text to its original state. They have to consider the probable causes of the Various Readings themselves: whether they have arisen through accident or by design. In the latter case, which is often to be suspected, they have to track the changes in the text to theological or other motives, and to estimate them accordingly. It is their task to weigh an endless variety of evidence in this sacred critical court; and, in coming to their decision on any controverted passage, they have to meet a multitude of conditions which demand attention. There are a few plain and reasonable principles which decide the great majority of cases: though their value is much contested among critics themselves; and their application to some residual difficulties is unsatisfactory. These canons are, for instance, that

the shorter reading is more likely to be the right than one more diffuse, "brevis lectio praeferenda verbosiori;" that the harder or rougher is more probably authentic than the smoother, " pro clivi lectioni praestat ardua;" that a text is suspicious which manifestly favors orthodox dogmas. None of these canons is unexceptionable. And it remains that the settlement of the text is a task that demands the application of the keenest critical faculty under the guidance of a most sober judgment. It is the business or prerogative of only a rare order of scholars, but the results achieved by their labors are of universal interest and value.

3. The theological bearing of this science is obvious. Nothing is more important than the purity of the common standard of appeal in dogmatic discussions and decisions. And, apart from that, it is the instinctive desire of all who love the Scriptures to read them in their integrity: every evidence of sure advancement towards a unanimously accepted text is matter of deep joy to one who knows how much depends on the issues.

(1.) This must not be exaggerated. It may be assumed that the eternal verities of revelation have not been permitted by the Holy Ghost to depend upon any isolated passage of His own word, nor upon the absolute integrity of the text generally. The majority of the contested passages, interpolations, and varieties of reading are of no doctrinal weight. Not one of them affects the sole fundamental proof of any article of faith: for the reason that no article of faith rests upon the evidence of any one single text.

Hence, though the variations in the leading MSS. amount to scores of thousands— including all, from changes in letters up to whole paragraphs inserted or omitted, —they involve no question vital to Christian doctrine. We may hope to see a text which humanly speaking, shall be perfect or near perfection: known and read of all men. But no thought about the guarantees or the stability of the Faith need be bound up with our hope.

(2.) Still, there are some variations in the text of the New Testament which are of profound interest. These, amounting to some twenty or thirty, ought to be carefully considered by every student; for, though no vital doctrine depends upon them, their evidence has a peculiar weight, and the secret history, so to speak, of the variations involves questions of deep theological import. For instance, modern criticism very generally agrees to give up " The Heavenly Witnesses," 1 opposition to the Vulgate and the Roman Catholic decision; but the study of the question will show how clear and full was the doctrine of the Trinity when such an interpolation could be made current. The same may be said as to the question whether instead of GOD was manifest in the flesh 2 we must read WHO was manifest, and whether we must retain the church of GOD which He hath purchased with His own blood or the church of THE LORD. 3 with this is closely connected the most striking of ill variations: the God Only-begotten 4 instead of the Onlybegotten Son in St. John’s Prologue. Other questions, such as the omission or retention of the Doxology in St. Matthew’s version of the Lord’s Prayer, have also their deep interest: as to this one in particular, there is good reason why we should incline to favor the cause of its retention, resting as it does on very strong arguments.

1 1 John 5:7; 2 1 Timothy 3:16; 3 Acts 20:28; 4 John 1:18

(3.) The Student may acquire sufficient skill to weigh well the arguments on both sides of these and similar leading points in the settlement of the text; and to come to a humble decision of his own. The peculiar and technical knowledge required in this study, and the variety of conditions that

must meet in those who exercise authoritative judgment as to the Text, limit Biblical Criticism, so far as its processes go, to a select number. The results, however, as affecting theology, are open to everyone. All may weigh the evidences which others collect, and appreciate the judgments they themselves could not independently form. THE FABRIC OF THE BIBLE.

BIBLICAL INTRODUCTION includes in its wide compass all that pertains to a knowledge of the Bible as made up of literary documents, and particularly as a collection of human literature. A certain amount of acquaintance, familiar acquaintance—the more intimate the better—with the fabric of Scripture is an obligation on the student of theology, especially the ministerial student.

1. The Bible as a whole is the history, the only history, of Religion, or of the relations between God and man, in the world. It contains the Chronicles of the One Kingdom, which has had three manifestations, ante-Mosaic, Hebrew, and Messianic; and of a fourth and final manifestation it contains an all-pervasive series of predictions. This is the bond of its unity, as one great Record of Prophecy and Fulfillment. The study of the volume, as unfolding one vast accomplishment now in process, and pointing to another not yet revealed, regards it as a complete organic unity, the bond of its perfectness being Christ and His kingdom.

2. But this organic unity may be resolved into subordinate Divisions. First, we have the several Great Dispensations already alluded to, and hereafter to be exhibited. These may be regarded in another form as the relation of the Two Testaments. The Old Testament— a name by which St. Paul almost seems to denominate the ancient volume, in the reading of the Old Testament1 — divides into the Law, or the historical basis; the Prophets, or the transition from the Law to the Gospel; the Psalms, or the devotional element for all ages. The New Testament is distributed into the Evangelicum or Four Gospels, the Apostolicum or Acts and Epistles, and the Apocalypticum or Revelation. In more modern times, the Gospels are distinguished as Synoptical, or the Three which unite in one general synopsis of the Lord’s ministry, and Johannaean; the Acts are regarded as transitional to the Epistles, and the several types of doctrine in the Apostolical Epistles and the Apocalypse are compared with the rest of Scripture. All these will be referred to in due course more fully.

1 2 Corinthians 3:14.

3. But every book has its own appropriate field of inquiry, this includes the writer, date, circumstances, and design of each document; especially the analysis in relation to its connection with its predecessors and successors. The theological importance of this is great: an accurate knowledge, however general, of the scope of every document will generally furnish its best defense against attacks; it will throw light on its doctrinal character and bearings, and thus locate it in the system of Biblical theology. A clear view of the literary and other peculiarities of every book in the Bible is indispensable to the student: it is one of the elementary requisites in theological education; but, perhaps on that very account, there is nothing which is more neglected. No young minister, no candidate for the ministry, should think he has acquired the rudiments of his profession until he has established in his mind a nucleus of information concerning all the individual documents: a nucleus around which additional knowledge shall continually gather, until there is no part left in obscurity.

BIBLICAL HISTORY.

1. The Bible must be studied as from beginning to end historical. This is the law of its construction in all parts, even the prophetical. Strictly speaking, its history as such is that of the Chosen People alone, as the pre-ordained race in which God would manifest Himself in the Incarnate Son; and the methodical study of that history is one of the first theological obligations. As contained in Scripture, and confirmed by secular historians, it is the most trustworthy series of national annals, as it is in relation to the history of redemption the most important. From Abraham to Moses, or the Bondage in Egypt, we have the Patriarchal Age; from the Desert to Canaan, or from Moses to Samuel, the foundation of the Theocracy; from the times of Judges and Kings, the Division of the Nation, the Captivity, the period of the glory of Old-Testament Israel. After the close of the inspired history of the old covenant comes the great Interval of four hundred years, ending with the Incarnation, the Appearance, Ministry, and Rejection of the Redeemer, and the Dispersion of the Tribes among the nations of the earth as the consequence.

These are the critical facts in that sacred history which may be regarded as in a certain sense the central stream of all history.

2. These salient points regulate the Scriptural Chronology, which, as a science, is perhaps the most abstruse and difficult connected with the interpretation of Scripture. It involves a consideration of the several systems which are adopted for the arrangement of Scriptural dates, especially in the Old Testament: the Septuagint differing from the Hebrew, and the Rabbinical from both: while the principles which regulated the sacred writers are not yet precisely determined. The solution of many chronological difficulties may be sought in errors of transcription; but there is an uncertainty as to the use of numerals which still has to be cleared up: the key has yet to be discovered for the scheme of Moses and the earlier historical writers. If it should appear that the longer system in which the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch agree is the correct one, it will not be difficult to harmonies the Biblical Chronology of early times with all that sound science, the authentic annals of other nations, and even their traditions require. When we descend lower in the stream of history the chronology becomes more simple. There are a few prominent epochs, the dates of which may be regarded as fixed: the Exodus, the Building of the Temple, the Deportations, the Birth of Christ, the Pentecost, the Death of Herod, the Destruction of Jerusalem. It must be remembered that the Art of Verifying Dates is comparatively modern; and time must be allowed for the settlement of many questions. Meanwhile, and with regard to some epochs, a latitude must be allowed, the limits of which are not defined.

3. The Biblical Geography includes almost the whole earth, but more particularly that part of it which is the sphere of sacred history: the Holy Land, originally Canaan, which became the Land of Immanuel. This is not only very interesting in itself, but bound up inseparably with the interpretation of Scripture.

4. The Archaeology of the Bible is a peculiar department of its history: including the entire fabric of the ancient Economy, viewed as past and apart from its relation to the Gospel. There is a sense in which no jot or tittle is really obsolete: as it may be asserted that almost everything Judaic has outlived the changes of time. But with this we have not here to do. The Antiquities of Scripture have two ranges: one of greater importance, including the civil and political and religious constitution of Hebraism, as lying under and around the very foundations of Christianity; and the other pertaining to the people as a mere branch of the Semitic race, with social and religious

usages that may be compared with those of other nations.

(1.) With reference to the former, the more essentially sacred of the antiquities of Hebraism, theological study has a wide scope. It includes the national tokens of severance from the world: the Covenant Signs, Circumcision, the Passover; with the earlier Tabernacle and the later Temple, and its interior symbolical structure as the dwelling-place of God among His people. Also the ceremonial of worship: the Levitical order; the High-priest-hood, with the relation of all other functions to it; the service and system of Sacrifice, the sin-offerings and thank-offerings, with their varieties; the Three Feasts, their history and meaning and typical significance; the One Fast; the Sabbaths and Sabbatic cycles; the New Moons; the voice of Prophecy, never absent; and the several methods of revelation, from Urim and Thummim, through symbols and visions, down to the Bath-kol which forms the transition to the next department.

(2.) There is also a post-Hebraic Archaeology belonging to the Judaism of the Interval, or, rather, to the time when Hebraism was passing into Judaism. In some respects the ancient Church appeared to greatest advantage after the Captivity: it inherited the past, by the lessons of which its chastisement prepared it to profit; it gave rise to many new institutions, some of which, specially sanctioned by our Lord, contained the germs of much that was incorporated into the Christian Church. It is hardly possible to study too carefully the annals of this Interval: for instance, the rise and history of the Sanhedrim; the constitution of the Synagogue and its order; the gradual ascendancy of Scribes, Rabbis, and other guardians of the law; the separation of the people into Pharisees and Sadducees and Essenes; and the new Festivals, such as the Purim, which our Lord approved, though not of direct Divine institution. A deep and peculiar theological interest attaches to this portion of the history of the great Preparations. The study of this period, as will be hereafter seen, never fails to be most amply repaid.

(3.) Many topics of Archaeology are subordinate, though such only in a relative sense. The interpretation of the New Testament requires an accurate and seasonably applied knowledge of the manners and customs of the ancient people: their mode of life, domestic architecture, merchandise, agriculture, festal and funereal rites, social habits, music, literary methods, style of writing, and forms of public and private instruction. The Commentaries furnish generally such information as the expositor or preacher requires; but the student should not be entirely dependent on incidental reinforcements of his memory. He should aim to be well read and at home in all these branches of sacred knowledge.

5. The Natural History of the Bible includes all that remains: that is, the world of nature in which Scripture lives and moves. It has its own comprehensive range, not to be studied as in the light of modern physical science, but not without its interest even in this respect. The Fauna and Flora of the Biblical records, as very faithfully depicted in the best Introductions and Monographs, have a theological as well as a general value: almost every fact will, somewhere or other, be found to affect the interpretation or illustration of New-Testament doctrine; and the importance of everything must be measured by its subservience to this object.

BIBLICALPHILOLOGY. The study of Scripture in its original languages lies at the foundation of theology. The text of revelation is in two tongues, each of which has its varieties and peculiarities. A certain knowledge of these is indispensable to the finished theologian, though neither his practical knowledge of the Bible nor the value of his pastoral ministry is dependent on a minute

and thorough acquaintance with them.

1. The Old Testament is written in Hebrew, with the exception of certain Chaldee fragments. 1 There has always been, and still is much discussion as to its relation to the original speech of the one undivided race of mankind: as also with regard to its affinities with what is inexactly called the Semitic stock of languages: the Aramaean, divided into Syriac and Chaldee; the Samaritan, a mixture apparently of Hebrew and Aramaean; and the Arabic, with its cognate Ethiopia. The profound study of the Old Testament requires that these Semitic dialects should be included: the Aramaean branches, because of the Chaldee portions of the Old Testament and the vernacular speech of our Savior's time which glimmers occasionally in the Gospels, and the important Peshito-Syriac version; the Arabic, because of its value in the determination of many Hebrew roots. But after all it is the pure Hebrew which is indispensable: not only for the sake of the Old Testament itself, but also because the New Testament is so much colored by direct quotations and indirect tones of speech.

1 Daniel 2:4 to end of chap. 7, Ezra 4:8-24; Ezra 5:1-17; Ezra 6:1-18; 7:12-26; Jeremiah 10:11.

2. The Greek in which it has pleased the Holy Ghost to enshrine the New-Testament Scriptures is the later classical dialect, the Koinh. This is its foundation; but it is deeply affected by the Jewish-Hellenistic dialect, with more or less infusion of Hebraisms in style and words: in some parts being no other than Hebrew thought in Greek clothing. The Alexandrian age was the link between the Oriental and the Western style; hence the Septuagint Version, the Apocrypha and Philo, are important helps for the study of sacred Greek To this must be added a certain new and peculiar phraseology and turn of expression which the new ideas of Christianity introduced. Taking all these things into account, we may say that the language of the New Testament is a distinct study, requiring its own apparatus of philological appliances and aids.

3. The two sacred languages, as they may be called, are in our days better understood, and the aids to their acquisition are more abundant, than in any former age. The Lexicons, Grammars, and Concordances of the Hebrew and the Greek are so accommodated to the student's necessity, that he may with ordinary diligence acquire at least a practical and working knowledge of the original Scriptures. A profound knowledge is possible only to few; but none who lay early their foundations need be without such an expertness in the use of the instruments of sacred philology as will enable them to appreciate the exposition of guides more learned than themselves. It is of great importance to be clear on this point. The noblest results of modern learning are found in Commentaries on the Bible. These are often in conflict on some critical points of exposition; and the reader is necessarily thrown on his own judgment. And that judgment he will be able to form if he habitually makes the originals his study, according to his best lights. And, apart from this, a very moderate acquaintance with the Greek Testament especially will bring the words of the Holy Ghost much nearer than any translation even the best can possibly do.

HERMENEUTICS.

There is a distinct science of Hermeneutics: that is, of the principles which are applied in Exegesis, the exposition and interpretation of Scripture. The science is an exceedingly extensive one, but its theological application rests on a few general principles, as simple as they are important.

I. The history of Biblical Hermeneutics in the Christian Church may be studied with advantage. There have not been successive schools; but the several schools have been marked by the preponderance of the allegorical or mystical, the ecclesiastica, or traditional, the literal or purely historical and rational principles more or less marked in every age. The earliest principle of interpretation that affected theology was that of the Alexandrian school, which always tended to the allegorizing method, as inherited from the Jewish Cabbala. It did not altogether neglect the grammatical interpretation of the "body" of Scripture, but paid more attention to the moral exhibition of its "soul," and most of all to mystical or anagogical uses for the initiated or teleioi. It is obvious that no definite or coherent system of dogmatic theology can be based on this principle of exposition, however rich it may be in results when duly controlled. During the Middle Ages this method more or less continued; but it was still more characteristic of those times that the exposition of Scripture was fettered by ecclesiastical bonds: first the Regula Fidei, or rather the Rule of the Church, directed it; independent research was checked; and Commentaries mostly took the form of Catenae, or Synopses of Patristic exposition, down to the Council of Trent. Meanwhile a free, historical method had here and there always-existed: especially in the early school of Antioch, and among the rationalist Schoolmen, such as Abelard. This has never been absent as a protest of learning against the excesses of the two other principles. Since the Reformation these tendencies have been perhaps more marked than before: the last, especially, has found its expression in the Rationalist exposition of modern times. It is now the highest aim of this science to combine the three: giving the profound spiritual sense, the traditional interpretation of the Church, and the scientific study of the text, their respective rights.

1. Hence we may reproduce these several methods and apply them to the general laws of Hermeneutics. The grammatical study of the plain text answers to all that was sound in the historical school; the observance of the analogy of faith displaces the ecclesiastical principle, the analogy being to a great extent the internal Biblical tradition itself as maintained in the purest traditions and exegesis of the Christian community; and dependence on the Holy Ghost, the interior Teacher, preserves the best secret of the allegorical or mystical school without its errors.

2. At the root of all lies the grammatical or literal interpretation: what is meant when it is said that the Bible must be interpreted like any other book. The Lexicons give the meaning of the words; the Grammar, their right construction; and the Concordance, the several writers’ distinctive phraseology. The student of Scripture, like the student of any ancient classics, has the key which enables him to understand what the Bible says, and what it means so far as the literal meaning goes.

3. It may be safely said that a very large proportion of the difficulties, harshnesses, and even apparent discrepancies of the Bible vanish before an exact application of the rules of grammar as to cases, prepositions, moods and tenses, especially of the Greek. Very much depends upon the simple grammatical meaning of the Aorist in those two correlative passages: Even so death passed upon all men, because all sinned; 1 and if One died for all, then all died.2 Modern commentaries yield ample evidence of this; as also the gradual improvement of our translations of Scripture. Further illustrations need not be given here: they will constantly occur in the development of our doctrine. But the fact cannot be too emphatically stated, that a grammatical and minute interpretation of the plain text is a great step in the understanding of the far larger portion of the Word of God.

1 Romans 5:12; 2 2 Corinthians 5:14.

4. The peculiarity and abundance of the figurative character of that text makes no essential difference: it belongs to universal grammar; and, though Biblical figure has its peculiar laws, obviously it also is amenable to a simple literal interpretation. The simpler tropes—by which, as the word tropos signifies, words or extended terms are merely turned from their natural meaning according to a general habit of mankind—abound in the Bible, as in all Oriental books. The Simile, or pure comparison; the Metaphor, which is the simile without the link of comparison; and the Metonymy, or Synecdoche, which describes an object by some of its relations or parts, all have the same meaning as in other literature: this is true even of such metaphors as I am the true Vine, 1 or The Lord God is a sun and shield; 2 and of the metonymy in They have Moses and the Prophets, 3 or We are the Circumcision. 4 The Scriptures, in fact, adopt these figures into their ordinary language to a very large extent. In some instances, it is undoubtedly important to distinguish between the figure as to be understood literally, and the figure as to be figuratively understood: a distinction on which hangs much theological discussion, as, for instance, in relation to the institution of the Eucharist. In the words This is My body which is given for you, and this cup is the New Testament in My blood, 5 we have metaphor and metonymy or synecdoche united. And, however true it is that something infinitely beyond grammatical interpretation is needed here, still the simple grammar itself goes far towards the right meaning. The same may be said of the more extended tropes, such as Allegory, Parable, and Symbol, which must have, whatever else they have, their natural interpretation. Allegory, as the expansion of Metaphor, has always a real history at its basis: as in that of the Vine brought out of Egypt 6 and St. Paul's allusion to Agar and Sarah. 7 The relations between the history and the veil that hides it require careful study in the light of analogy hereafter to be considered. But, supposing the key necessary to its theological solution found afterwards, the simple grammatical exposition of the trope remains. So of the Parable. —Our Lord's peculiar, affecting, and, it may be said, unshared method of teaching, —which is the Simile expanded. It has its one great point of resemblance, and always its subordinate accessories; but the relation between these must be carefully studied first as a mere parable before higher principles are brought in. The Symbol, which is an indefinite trope that pervades Scripture, ranging from a word or a number up to actions with complicated scenery, has its own laws, which form a deeply interesting and important branch of sacred Hermeneutics; but these laws do not in any case dispense with the literal meaning.

1 John 15:1; 2 Psalms 84:11; 3 Luke 16:29; 4 Php 3:3; 5 Luke 22:19-20; 6 Psalms 80:1-19; 7 Galatians 4:1-31.

II. The Analogy of Faith suggests a second canon of interpretation which applies to Scripture as different from all other writings. This is a wide term, and includes, in fact, three ranges of application: first, the close observation not only of the writer's context but of his general strain of teaching, as he is one representative of the inspired doctrine; in connection with that, perpetual reference to the universal harmony of Scriptural truth, as given by one inspiring Spirit; and, finally, the appeal to the principles of the Faith as held by the Catholic Church from the beginning.

1. Each inspired writer has his Charisma or Gift, his own style of phraseology and of theological thought. For instance, while the inspired Apostles can have but one doctrine of Christian Righteousness, St. Paul and St. James are instructed to present it under a different aspect; as

each also employs the term Law with his own distinct shades of meaning. Now it must be a canon that the interpretation of both be harmonized by understanding each according to the analogy of his own general teaching. The rule applies with great force to the New Testament: St. Paul uses many elect words, such as Grace, Law, Reckon, in his own way; St. John has his terms also, such as Heart for Conscience; and the law of analogy requires that this key be applied to every discussion of the meaning of these writers respectively.

2. The same holds good throughout the Bible, whether of the Old Testament or of the New. There is an analogy of Scripture: a rule or standard of doctrine, pervading the entire oracles of God; and all exposition must be faithful to it. This must govern the interpretation of the Divine Word as being a gradual development of one harmonious Truth: there is one doctrine of the Trinity, of the Person of Christ, of Sin, of Redemption, of Faith and Works, of the Holy Spirit's influence, of Immortality; and all these are in harmony with the one keynote of the whole, the Reconciliation of God and Man in Christ. The application of this canon is in one sense exceedingly difficult, in another it is exceedingly easy. But, difficult or easy, it is an inexorable law, that the exegesis of every sentence of Scripture must accord with its own supreme Rule of Faith. Christ is everywhere. And, although the searching of the Scriptures in order to find the testimony of Jesus in them may be and has been carried to excess, it has been so only in the case of those who have not qualified this canon or guarded it by the direct application of the others.

3. Once more, there is what may be termed, adopting St. Paul's expression, the Analogy of the Faith—katá teén analogían teés písteoos 1 —which is really the analogy of Scripture as confirmed in the catholic belief of the best ages and of the purest confessions of the Church of Christ. This canon is of great importance, if rightly applied and duly guarded in the application. It regulates, of course, only the exegesis of passages which involve fidelity or unfaithfulness to the leading principles of the Gospel: these have been held in every age by the Catholic Body, and their interpretation ought to have great weight with us. The earliest creeds declare their belief in the leading doctrines; their almost unanimous exposition of these has come down in a pure tradition; and he is the wiser as well as the more modest interpreter who gives their testimony some weight at least. This, however, leads at once to the third canon, on which finally depend the life, truth, and security of Biblical Hermeneutics.

1 Romans 12:6.

III. The Holy Spirit's immediate presence in Holy Scripture— both as its Defender and as its Interpreter—is in this science both a law and a guide of interpretation: as such it is the corrective of the subjective spirit, whether mystical or allegorical or rationalistic. The Inspiration of the Bible is its Guardian also.

1. He is the Expositor within the Scripture itself; He ex-pounds the Old Testament by the New: type by antitype; and ancient text by new style and form of quotation. Nothing is more profitable to the human commentator than to follow in the steps of the Divine: marking diligently how He expounds the ancient oracles in the new ones, and faithfully making His methods theirs for the exposition of both.

2. He continues His interpretation in the Christian Church, and to the minds of all who steadfastly believe in the reality of His presence and guidance. He preserves the regenerate spirit in its true

and deep sympathy with the written Word; or, in His own better language, gives the spiritual sense and discernment on which the right understanding of Scripture depends. Its truths are spiritually discerned. 1 But he that is spiritual judgeth all things. Moreover, it is not fanaticism to believe that He answers every suppliant, especially every minister responsible for the teaching of His people, who consults the Oracle in simple prayer. In ancient times the Lord gave counsel to the leaders of the congregation who inquired at the high priest's breastplate of judgment. 2 The Christian Revelation has abolished the typical symbols of Urim and Tlummim; but it has given us the reality of their Doctrina et Veritas, their Revelation and Truth.3 And none ever sought or shall ever seek this Oracle in vain. For our encouragement it is written: Ye have an unction from the Holy One.4 1 1 Corinthians 2:14-15; 2 Numbers 27:21; 3 Exodus 28:30; 4 1 John 2:20.

EXEGESIS AND THEOLOGY. The result of all these is Exegesis, either pure exposition of the text or applied in the pastoral teaching of the ministerial functions; Biblical Theology, or the systematic construction of Scriptural doctrine, as such, and in its purely Scriptural forms and arrangements; and Dogmatic Theology, containing the analyzed results of all later definitions and developments.

I. Exegetical theology is the fruit of the application of Hermeneutics in particular, and generally of all Biblical study, to the theological interpretation of the text. Of course, there are commentaries which deal only with its grammatical rendering; but with such we have nothing to do: the very word, in its Greek form of exegesis or in its Latin form of exposition, signifies more than that. It is the drawing out and presentation of the sense.

1. As such it occupies a large and abundant place in Christian literature: ranging from monographs on detached passages and paragraphs, through expositions of the several books, up to commentaries on the whole of Scripture. There cannot be much doubt that the best and purest exhibition of Christian truths is to be found in books devoted to the direct exposition of the Sacred Word; but the value of these books is generally in the ratio of their concentration, and the richest products of modern exegesis are the result of earnest and learned labor on individual documents or on the writings of individual men.

2. Exegesis is applied in Practical Theology: the most important being that which takes form in the ministry of the Word, or the pastoral teaching of the congregation. The principles that govern the application of Hermeneutics to preaching belong to Homiletics: which in modern times has been made a distinct science, aiming to guide the Christian Pastor in the best methods of unfolding the mysteries of the Faith to his flock, and of preaching the Gospel to those who are without.

II. Biblical theology is the noblest superstructure erected on the foundation of Hermeneutical science proper.

1. It arranges systematically, and in its unity, the boundless variety of truth which in Scripture is presented under a process of development, at sundry times and in divers manners. 1 Its systematic arrangement, however, aims rather to exhibit the stages of development than the final results: though not excluding the latter. It is occupied with the relations between the theology of the Old Testament and that of the New: a subject of ever growing interest. It deals also with the various schools of teaching and thought into which the inspired writers may be distributed. Hence it is dispensational theology: exhibiting the doctrines of every economy as it expanded the heritage of truth dispensed to its predecessor. Especially in the New Testament it has an ample field:

showing the variations and harmonies that may be observed among the various writers. Hence it presents the development of Christian Doctrine in its course of various but orderly disclosure from Genesis to Revelation.

1 Hebrews 1:1.

2. Biblical theology lies at the foundation of Dogmatic, giving it its security and its strength. From age to age Scriptural doctrine has assumed in the Christian Church new forms of statement, arrangement, definition, and terminology. When the development of Divine doctrine ceased, the development of human dogma began. Doubtless one and the selfsame Spirit has presided over both though His presidency has not been of the same kind. But the sole guarantee for the soundness of our Systematic Theology, through all its branches, is its fidelity to the exposition of the Word of God as the only standard of truth, the only RULE OF FAITH.

07. Vol 01 - The Existence and Notion of God

The Existence and Notion of God

GOD. THE EXISTENCE AND NOTION OF GOD THE BEING OF GOD: In what sense Innate and Demonstrable IN THE CONSTITUTION OF HUMAN NATURE COSMOLOGICAL AND TELEOLOGICAL ARGUMENTS;

Consensus Gentium LIMIT OF ALL ARGUMENT The Secret of Antitheism THE NOTION OF GOD

Partial;

Real; and

Sufficient

GOD.

GOD is ALL IN ALL throughout the whole compass of Theology: everywhere both its Subject and its Object and the unity of these. But there is a specific doctrine of God which falls into two branches: first, the existence of the Supreme Being as an object generally of human thought and knowledge; and, secondly, the more specific revelation of His nature and attributes. It is obvious that these two cannot be kept entirely distinct: each involves the other to a certain extent; but they may be usefully distinguished as God’s revelation of Himself IN man and TO man as consummated in Holy Scripture. THE EXISTENCE AND NOTION OF GOD. The existence of God may be regarded either as an innate assurance or conviction of the human mind that needs no proof, or as a verity that demonstrates itself to reason by its credentials. According to the former view this eternal truth, the sum of all truth, is a necessary element in man’s consciousness, as created in the Divine image. But, in consequence of the disturbance of human reason, it is necessary that theology should be prepared to arrange the elements of this consciousness into a formal system of arguments in defense of His existence. With this are inseparably bound up the reality and measure of the knowledge of God possible to man. THE EXISTENCE OF GOD. The Being of a God is at once an innate idea and a truth demonstrable and to be demonstrated. Here we use popular language which will receive its more full and sufficient explanation in due course.

INNATE. The existence of God, God alone can reveal. He has wrought this supreme truth into the constitution of human nature as its Creator. Scripture, which never proves the being of the Eternal, appeals to this consciousness; it also gives the reason of its disturbance, and thus by anticipation obviates the force of every argument against it. The history of the human race demonstrates, by the very perversions of the idea of God to which it bears witness, the fact that His existence needs no demonstration. And there is no sound philosophical or psychological reasoning which can withstand this principle, rightly understood and adequately guarded.

I. The Scriptures, as addressed to man universal, assume that in his nature there is a consciousness of a Supreme Being, on Whom he depends, and to Whom he is responsible.

1. It gives the grounds of the sublime presupposition, of the knowledge which from Genesis to Revelation, speaking to Jews and Gentiles and the whole human creation of God, it everywhere takes for granted. It appeals to the law written in their hearts, 1 which implies a Lawgiver; and to the sense of dependence which feels after the Source of all existence, if haply they might feel after Him, and find Him: 2 find Him, Who is already known, in order to the relief of its fears and the satisfaction of its desires. But it goes even higher than this, and everywhere teaches that in the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made He him, 3 which has never been lost: for in Him we live and move and have our being; as certain even of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring. 4 And, although we must not press this testimony too far, it most certainly declares this at least, that the very life of the dependent creature is bound up with the idea of its Independent Source, the very thought of God in man's mind—to anticipate a future argument—assumes that God is. It goes higher still, if possible. It declares that the eternal Logos or Word is the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. 5 And this precedes, in order of time and of thought, that higher revelation which follows: No man hath seen God at any time; the Onlybegotten [Son], Which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him. 6 He is Himself the manifestation of the invisible God, but only as revealing Himself to a preparatory consciousness in mankind. ekeínos exeegeésato: the Son expounded in a final exegesis the original text implanted in universal human nature.

1 Romans 2:15; 2 Acts 17:27; 3 Gen, 5:1; 4 Acts 17:28; 5 John 1:9; 6 John 1:18.

2. Every objection that may be urged against the universality of this consciousness it obviates by showing that two reasons have obscured the truth in human nature: through sin men did not like to retain God in their knowledge; and therefore God gave them over to a reprobate mind, 1 or a mind void of judgment. The only atheism that the Scripture admits is practical atheism: that which the fool hath said in his heart. 2 St. Paul speaks of the Gentiles as átheoi en toó kósmoo, ATHEISTS in the world. 3 But this is opposed to being in Christ; and signifies rather forsaken of God than either denying Him or entirely ignorant of Him, though these cannot be altogether excluded from the text.

1 Romans 1:28; 2 Psalms 14:1; 3 Ephesians 2:12.

3. Hence the general proposition that our evidence of the Supreme is innate and connate. This does not mean that the full knowledge is formed in every mind as an object of consciousness, but that the constitution of human nature is such that it naturally develops a consciousness of God when God presents Himself, even as it grows up into a consciousness of self and of the outer world. That consciousness of the Infinite Being may be morally perverted, even as the consciousness of self, and of the external world, may be intellectually perverted by a false philosophy. It may assume a thousand forms, from the blind fetish of abject superstition, through all the variations of Polytheism up to Pantheism, or the materialistic theories that unwittingly make the eternal evolutions of unintelligent law into the very Being Whom they reject. This leads at once to the theological arguments in proof of this fundamental truth.

DEMONSTRABLE.

All processes of this argument rest finally on the analysis of that original consciousness of God which is the birthright of man as a creature: hence they are derived, first, from an appeal to the

nature of the human spirit itself; secondly, from a consideration of the relation of the human mind to the phenomena of the universe: and, thirdly, from the universal Theism of the race as the result of both. These arguments serve to show the groundlessness of all atheistic theories, whether they negatively exclude God, or positively assert His non-existence. But there is a limit to their demonstrative force as human evidences: they require the enforcement of the Holy-Spirit's influence as Divine credentials; and must in every case derive their strength from the further revelation of God as to His own essence and perfections. THE CONSTITUTION OF HUMAN NATURE. The first and best credentials of the existence of a Supreme Being are found in the elements of human nature itself.

1. The simplest form of the argument is to be sought in the moral constitution of man, which in reason or conscience proclaims the existence of a Supreme Lawgiver, and in its desires and aspirations the existence of a Supreme Object for communion with whom it was made. These are elements of our nature and not the result of education; they are primary, intuitive, and universal; refusing at the outset all argument upon their origin. If conscience is the moral consciousness—its only sound definition—it as much implies a spiritual world into which man is born as consciousness generally implies the natural world. If it is the reason or heart or central personality of man it gives a testimony, supreme in the soul, to a Power Who rules in righteousness and hates iniquity. The rational law of our nature is its moral law. It points to a Holy Governor, Whom it suggests or to whom it appeals, above the visible world nothing in which is capable of exciting its emotions. And the universal feeling of dependence on a Being or a Person higher than ourselves reinforces this argument: the same heart in man which trembles before an authority above him yearns to be able to trust in Him. This may be called the MORAL demonstration.

2. This argument is known and read of all men. Another line of reasoning, also based upon the constitution of our nature, is not, however so obvious or not so immediately obvious to all minds. It is that there is in the spirit or reason of man a clear idea of a Perfect Being: there must be an objective reality corresponding to this. The argument is put in a variety of forms: for instance, we cannot conceive the non-existence of space and time: there must be an Infinite Substance, of whom these are the accidents or who must be at the ground of these. The ideas of infinity, eternity, absoluteness must have a reality somewhere: many who have denied the being of God have been obliged to invest matter or the world with some of these qualities. They are primary laws of thought; and strongly suggest what they may not be able to prove. They at any rate silently protest against Antitheism in every form. To this class belong all these impressive, and to some orders of mind most cogent, arguments derived from it, the ideas of infinite goodness and of unchangeable truths in the soul; these must have their ultimate ground in a Being of absolute and essential goodness and truth. The Platonic Ideas, essential and not phenomenal, must be eternally inherent in a Perfect Supreme. Multitudes of arguments have been reasoned out which are only variations on this. They show both their strength and their weakness in the position of Descartes that the thought of God implies the existence of God. Such reasoning is called ONTOLOGICAL, and sometimes by abuse of the term A PRIORI. It is too abstract for common use, and as usually put its reasoning is really A POSTERIORI : it infers a Divine Being, from premises already within; and strictly speaking belongs to the next department of our demonstration. THE EXTERNAL UNIVERSE.

Arguments from the phenomena of the universe are divided into two closely related and in some sense identical branches.

1. First, the COSMOLOGICAL reasoning demands a sufficient cause for every effect; and is therefore sometimes called the AEtiological argument, from aitia, cause. It has been used in every age, both within and without the sphere of revelation. Augustine gave it noble expression when he said: Interrogavi mundi molem de Deo meo, et respondit mihi: non ego sum, sed ipse me fecit. But the first words of the Bible respond by anticipation to the appeal for a sufficient reason of all things, a permanent Cause of all phenomenal and transitory existence. The idea of causation is a primary law of thought: not arising from the observation of sequence in things. The mind of man demands a cause of his own being, of the universe around him: the Eternal First Cause is an absolute necessity of thought. Discussions as to the nature of causality, and the origin of our notion of it, have been many. All they have done is to help us by urging that we have no right to assume that all existence must have what we call a cause. They cannot overturn our conviction that every event and every effect with a known origin must have a reason for its existence or occurrence. The material creation is a universe: we only know it as such; as such science demonstrates that it had a beginning and a law. There is nothing absolutely permanent in matter as we know it; we cannot track it beyond its arrangements; its ultimate constitution is a composition of atoms. And of the universe as we know it there must have been a Cause of supernatural Power and Wisdom. This holds good of every combination of molecules and of the stupendous universe itself. No subordinate cause can be a cause properly speaking. The mind never rests but in a Cause uncaused: free, intelligent, and, we may perhaps add, omnipotent.

2. Secondly, the TELEOLOGICAL form of this argument—from telos, the end, —observes the infinite proofs of a designing Mindin the laws and arrangements of the universe. This is not a question of Final Causes, to which the human mind is incompetent to ascend: that is of final in the sense of ultimate. It is a question of the adaptations of everything to an end in itself, also of all things to ends in relation to other things united in one aggregate or unity. This physico-theological argument derives its materials from the creation everywhere, as well as from the adaptation of man’s mental and spiritual faculties to the world around. Hence the field in which it expatiates is literally boundless. All the physical sciences unconsciously provide the argument with its premises; and no sound science, physical or metaphysical, rejects the conclusion. Mathematics, the alphabet of physical science, only detects the quantitative laws of the universe. And every science without exception shows that the order and adaptation and harmonies of nature are such as make the chances no less than infinite against the supposition of Chaos, or the absence of one designing intelligence. Newton’s words concerning astronomy are true of all regions of science: Elegantissima haecce compages solis, planetarum, et cometarum et stellarum non nisi consilio et dominio entis cujusdam potentis et intelligent oriri potuit. And all that is said as to the adaptations of inorganic and organic nature may be said of the relation of the human mind to the whole. The cumulative argument is literally irresistible to all but those who deny final causes altogether, and with that denial make everything the result of chance. THE CONSENSUS GENTIUM.

These two classes of arguments, separately or in combination, consciously or unconsciously, have largely swayed the general thought of mankind. The world has been more or less THEISTIC from the beginning: the idea of a supernatural world and supernatural beings has never been absent. This is the testimony of Scripture; universal history consents; and the fact is itself a strong

subordinate auxiliary to all other reasoning. The modern science, so called, of Comparative Religions has done good service in showing that even the forms of the perversion of Theism bear witness to the truth: Polytheism and Pantheism, which are only distortions of the one great idea, and have, for the most part, divided mankind, are evidences almost universal of the force of the conclusions drawn from the constitution of human nature and the evidences of inferior powers controlled by the Supreme Power in the universe. Natural religion is at once proof of the irresistible force of these arguments and itself an additional argument.

LIMIT OF ALL ARGUMENT. This leads to a consideration of the value or sufficiency of argumentation on this subject: in other words, of the question whether the existence of God can be demonstrated at all.

There is a limitation which may be referred to the great question itself, as also one that may be referred to the mind of him who disbelieves.

1. It cannot be denied that the perversion of the human intellect under evil influence is such that it may refuse to accept, or be incapable of perceiving, the evidence of the being of such a Deity as these arguments demonstrate. Man may sink into such a state as to think himself an atheist: indeed, he may suppress the idea of God in his nature altogether.

Although, generally speaking, pure atheism is rare, and still rarer anti-theism, or the revolt against the possibility of the supremacy of One Ruler of the universe, yet both are to be found among men of unquestionable strength of intellect. This is a phenomenon of which a good account may be given. It may be fairly said that the idea of God is generally rejected only in the sense of being disguised. The unknown and unknowable Force of the philosophy of Nescience, or the Pantheistic Absolute evolving itself in all things, is only the Christian Creator under a most unworthy name. The modern Materialist whose creed is, Matter I know, and force I know, but what is God? is unconsciously asserting the Power he denies: he belongs to the class of men who hold the truth in unrighteousness. 1 Their unrighteousness may not be deliberate defiance of the eternal laws of morality; but it is most certainly injustice to the clearest and most explicit demands of their own nature which cries out for the Living God.

1 Romans 1:18.

2. But the argument that arises to prove the being of the Supreme is undoubtedly beset with many difficulties. These are found mainly in the anomalies of the moral world as under the will of a supposed Divine Providence: anomalies which are as it were reflected in the physical world as the sphere of that Providence. These difficulties we have to meet hereafter at many points where they specially press. Meanwhile it is enough to say that such obstacles to faith produce different effects on different minds. Some they lead to pure ATHEISM: that is, the simple omission of the notion of God from the sum of things, nothing being left but a material universe the highest form of whose blind and undirected and causeless energy is thought. But this may take a skeptical form, and decline to pronounce on the non-existence of God. It may object to the system of MATERIALISM or POSITIVISM as unphilosophically positive, and content itself with the assertion of NESCIENCE. But it may so brood over the obliquities of the known universe as to reach the point of a desolate and bold ANTITHEISM, pronouncing the existence of One Supreme, at once all-powerful and infinitely loving, an impossibility.

3. One secret of this antitheistic sentiment among men is the failure to weigh well the whole argument all round. No one demonstration is sufficient of itself. Each gives and receives strength when viewed as one element in a reasoning which has unbounded resources. A narrow view of things, fixing its thought upon some one fascinating discord, may lead to the rejection of God: a large and wide view of the whole, as by a necessity of thought under the supremacy of some vast unity of government, can never accept either Atheism or Antitheism. But another secret is that the disturbance of sin has rendered a Divine assertion of God Himself necessary. Man may refuse to believe and argue himself into what is very much like the ridding and baring his mind of all idea of Divinity. Hence, secondly, all the demonstrations usually given of the existence of the Supreme are simply the preliminaries to the revelation of the Divine nature by the Eternal Word and the Eternal Spirit. In fact, and to speak boldly, they arc rather for those who believe already than for those who believe not. At any rate, the very best exhibition of arguments in favor of the existence of the Deity leaves the subject imperfect, until the revelation of His nature and name and attributes gives the demonstration its crown and completeness. THE NOTION OF GOD.

Revelation is in the highest sense Theology, or the science of the knowledge of God. This knowledge must be considered, first, as possible to man, and then as imparted to him. The former involves the question in what sense man may know the Supreme and Absolute Being; and the latter in what way this Being has revealed His essence and His attributes to His creature capable of that knowledge. The conception of the Divine nature which is possible to man is of necessity partial and limited; but it is true knowledge, as corresponding to reality in its Object; and, for the regulation of man's life of faith, it is sufficient. The establishment of these propositions will show the harmony between all sound philosophy and Divine revelation. THE NOTION OF GODPARTIALBUT REAL AND SUFFICIENT.

I. When Scripture speaks of God as dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen nor can see, 1 it means what philosophy means when it says that we cannot define in our thought the Infinite. We cannot comprehend God in the sense of understanding Him in His essence, attributes, and universal relations. Deus cognosci potest, comprehendi non potest. We cannot search and find Him out unto perfection. He is and must be to every created faculty, and that for ever, in some sense an UNKNOWN GOD. None but the Infinite can know the Infinite. St. Paul's testimony, as given above, may be said to close the long array of Scriptural testimonies on this subject.

After an endless abundance of revelations, in which man's knowledge of God is asserted with almost every variation of the term knowledge, it declares that in some sense He still remains incomprehensible. Something has been said on this subject when Revelation was in question, and something will be said under the Divine Attributes; it will be needful now only to show that the Biblical doctrine of the unknowableness of God mediates between two extremes of philosophical thought. On the one hand, it corrects the error that there can be no knowledge of the Divine Being as an object of faith; and, on the other, it corrects the error that the Divine Being is or can be perfectly revealed in the reason of man.

1 1 Timothy 6:16; 1. However paradoxical it may seem, it is true that theology has to defend the doctrine of the unsearchableness of Deity. There is a Pantheistic and transcendental philosophy which in some sense makes man the measure of God, and boasts that the human reason is

capable of the knowledge of the Supreme in the same sense and to the same extent as it is capable of any other knowledge. This error may be viewed in two lights.

(1.) It exaggerates the prerogative of reason as an organ of truth. By reason is here meant that transcendental faculty which is supposed intuitively to take cognizance of the Infinite. According to Hegel, who with all his obscurity is the best representative of this Pantheistic philosophy, God knows Himself in man, the human consciousness of Him is His own consciousness finding expression in human thought more or less distinct according to the measure of intellect, but always a clear intuition of the Infinite. There is an infinite, impersonal, and Divine reason in mankind of which each individual has his share; and in short man's knowledge of God is simply God knowing Himself in him.

Hence God is man in miniature, and man is a fragment of God.

(2.) This error makes man the measure of Deity, and reduces the Supreme essence to a subjective creation of man's own mind. The Infinite and Absolute One is brought within the limits of human thought, being only the negation of the finite or its correlative: the finite and the infinite being each a distinct conception and finding their unity in the term God. But from this negative or negation to the positive nothing of the older Pantheistic mystics there is but a step. This philosophy, professing to make God simply what He is to us and in us, really removes Him to a measureless distance: He is epekeina pashs ousias, the superessential being which is of course no being at all. Thus extremes meet: the Divinity Who is contracted within the limits of human thought, and brought too close at hand, is really sent afar off. 1 Such an adventurous theory of a perfect cognizance of the Infinite by a human faculty which is God Himself within us really destroys the knowledge of the Infinite and Eternal Being altogether.

1 Jeremiah 23:23.

(3.) Hence we must impress upon our minds the fact that all our knowledge of God is limited: limited in us for ever as we are creatures, limited in its impartation to us as we are creatures whose faculties of knowledge are in themselves under the limitations of time and space, and limited still further as our faculties are impaired and disturbed by sin.

2. Modern religious philosophy has betrayed a tendency to go to the opposite extreme, and to exaggerate the unthinkableness and the unknowableness of God. The limits of religious thought are defined by too narrow a theory, which postulates three things: that there can be no knowledge of the Absolute whatever as a Person, an absolute unconditioned personality being inconceivable and incogitable; that what of God we cannot know we may nevertheless and must believe in. despite of reason: and that consequently all our knowledge of God is Regulative Knowledge simply, not answering to truth in Him but given us in this life for the direction of our thoughts and lives. On this theory a few remarks may be made, preparatory to the next principle that our knowledge of God is so far as it goes real.

(1.) It begs the question throughout. It assumes to know that very absolute and infinite which it professes not to know. It is itself thinking the unthinkable and conceiving the inconceivable. How does it know that the Infinite cannot be a Person, that infinity and personality are contradictory terms? How does it know that personality is essentially a limitation and a relation? It is so in a finite creature; but who that knows not the Infinite Being can dare to say that it is so with HIM or with IT?

Here the entire subject might be left: this perilous hypothesis is at all points a glaring petitio principii.

(2.) It dishonors both the reason that it disparages and the faith which it dignifies. It makes reason pronounce that an infinite consciousness is a contradiction, that there cannot be an absolute cause of anything not itself; and, at the same timer demands that faith should accept what reason absolutely denies. This brings reason and faith into a most incongruous and mutually degrading conflict. Were the position this, that reason is the faculty judging according to sense, and faith the faculty that carries reason into the region of spiritual existence, correcting its error and supplementing its defects, we might understand and accept it. But that faith is obliged to accept what is not merely above reason but directly contradicted by it, that faith is directed to an Object utterly unknown and utterly unknowable, is an assumption that undermines the foundations of truth.

3. This theory leads to very dangerous issues as it teaches the doctrine of a merely regulative knowledge. The very word regulative indicates the peril: our knowledge of God is given us for the direction not only of our thoughts but of our lives also. If our thoughts of Him do not correspond to the reality, the Author of our mental constitution forces us to believe what is not true. But God who cannot err cannot deceive us. If our conscience and sense of responsibility to a Judge, if our desires for communion with a Personal Father, have no corresponding realities, where is our religion and where the Gospel on which it rests? We cannot exaggerate the importance of what is at stake here.

II. Hence the knowledge we have of God is, therefore, a real knowledge. There are many ways in which it pleases the Supreme to reveal Himself: but they all imply that He gives us a true perception of His own nature so far as it goes. He does not deceive us as to His being; and the mental conception of Himself to which He trains us corresponds to the reality: thus our knowledge is real as in us and real as of Him.

1. All here depends on the meaning and extent of the term knowledge; and again much also depends on the distinction between knowledge generally and the specific knowledge which in Scripture is appropriated for our use concerning the Deity.

(1.) Knowledge is the true and right relation of the knowing mind to the object known.

God is the absolute truth, and when our conceptions are conformable to that object we know God. Now, it is of the essence of the Infinite that it passeth knowledge; and the conception of a Being who cannot be fully comprehended in His eternal nature is a true knowledge of Him, a knowledge in us conformed to the truth in Him. The conception of the general term for God is true to His nature. It is part of its truth that it does not profess to perceive by immediate presentation His very essence. In no sense does it assume to see God. But it is a true knowledge we have of Him, just as it is a true knowledge that we have of our souls which we do not see, of the existence of matter which we do not see, and of all other objects of our cognizance, so far as concerns their nature in themselves and apart from their secondary properties. There is no definition of knowledge which does not admit of our truly knowing God.

(2.) But it must be remembered that the Scriptures distinguish the knowledge which is allied with true faith from every other kind of knowledge. It admits that the Gentiles knew God; and their

knowledge was in a certain sense connected with their faith in the testimony of their own consciousness and of the external world. That faith reached a very high point in some of the most enlightened of the heathen; as for instance in Plato, whose definition of God has never been surpassed in sublimity: Light is the shadow of the Deity, Lumen est umbra Dei, et Deus est Lumen luminis. Nor need we doubt that the influences of the Divine Spirit glowed in the minds of many of the ancient philosophers to whom, as Jamblichus said, Esse nostrum est Deum cognoscere, to know God is our very being. We must not, however, forget that since we have seen the Father in Christ, both faith and knowledge have put on their perfection. 1 Faith in Jesus has become strengthened to behold more directly than before its Eternal Object; our dim conception has been transfigured into the certitude of knowledge: gnosis, has become, so to speak, epignosis.

Man's notion of the Divine Being has undergone its final change in this world; and the reality of our knowledge has become more real. It may be said that the most emphatic terms that could be used are used to describe our possible acquaintance with the Divine Being.

1 John 14:9.

2. It is the true knowledge of a reality in God, of that ENS REALE which answers to the ENS RATIONIS in the human mind here we must remember that we are not left to ontological or metaphysical speculation. The assumption of our theology is that God reveals Himself to man as made in His own image, and permits him to infer the perfection in his Maker of what in himself is imperfect. The entire course of Scripture sanctions and encourages this view. What is called ANTHROPOMORPHISM is the style adopted by the Almighty when He speaks and acts as a man. This is the prevalent method of the Bible; where God speaks to man as the finite copy of His infinite Self. He says, My thoughts are not your thoughts, 1 but only in the sense of being nobler; and, neither are your ways My ways, but only in the sense of being better. We are not deceived by Him 2 when we are encouraged to think that the same things are true in Him and in us. Personality, power, goodness, truth, love, are reflections in us of His image; realities in us corresponding to realities in Him.

He that planted the ear, shall He not hear?He that formed the eye, shall He not see?3 This is the poetry of Anthropomorphism; but it teaches the profound truth that we are transcripts from an eternal Archetype, after which we are refashioned by being conformed to the Image of the invisible God, the Son of God incarnate, the Firstborn of every creature. 4 The Incarnation is the pledge that human nature may have a true knowledge of the Divine.

1 Isaiah 55:8; 2 1 John 2:8; 3 Psalms 94:9; 4 Colossians 1:15.

III. The knowledge of which man is capable, and which he Sufficient receives, is sufficient: sufficient for the purpose of probation in his present estate, where he only waits, at the threshold of eternal knowledge, for the more direct vision of God.

1. There is an important sense in which the modern expression Regulative Knowledge is strictly appropriate, and may be rescued from its misapplication. It is a disclosure adapted to our probationary condition; and as such is sufficient for our worship and our duty, for our hope and our fear, for our contemplation and our desire. For the present we have a reflected presentation in a mirror darkly, we know in part. 1 But it must be remembered that the Savior, the Only Revealer, has assured us how high is this regulative and imperfect knowledge. It is that indeed, but much

more than that: it is the light of life.

2 He makes it most emphatically a continuation and bestowment of His own Divinehuman knowledge: Neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him. 3 The Being Whom the New Testament reveals is very different from the abstract and inconceivable form of being which, rather than whom, modern philosophy would substitute. Such a God, without form and void, neither the knowledge of the understanding nor the knowledge of the heart will be content to receive.

1 1 Corinthians 13:12; 2 John 8:12; 3 Matthew 11:27.

2. Divines formerly distinguished between a THEOLOGIA VIATORUM and a THEOLOGIA BEATORUM: the theology of the pilgrims and the theology of the beatified. Of the future notion of God of which the beatific vision will be the medium the Scripture tells us that it will be that which we now have made perfect. Then shall we KNOW even as we ARE KNOWN: 1 the knowledge in part shall not be exchanged for a truer knowledge, only for a knowledge more full. The one knowledge is the preparation for the other, and will vanish away: 2 vanish only as encumbered with symbols and images and innumerable restrictions of the flesh which weighs down the incorruptible spirit; vanish only as the old law vanished when it disappeared and yet reappeared in a new law, the law of the everlasting Gospel.

1 1 Corinthians 13:12; 2 1 Corinthians 13:8.

08. Vol 01 - The Divine Essence and Perfections

The Divine Essence and Perfections THE DIVINE ESSENCE AND PERFECTIONS THE DIVINE NATURE AND NAMES

ESSENTIAL NAMES Elohim and Jehovah, with their Correlation in the Old Testament and the New

God's revelation of Himself is given in names which declare His nature and His perfections. Some of those names refer rather to the eternal Essence in itself as the one and only real being, some to the Divine Existence and nature as disclosed or revealed in His works, and some present God as the Substance clothed with its attributes. From these, as progressively unfolded throughout the Scriptures, we may humanly define the Essence of God, and arrange in reverent order the Divine perfections.

1. The phrase in most common use, and the only one used in Scripture, is THE DIVINE NATURE. This, according to its derivation, is scarcely applicable in any other than an accommodated and conventional sense to God: indeed, the only instance of its use in Scripture refers to our being made partakers of the Divine nature, 1 meaning either the moral excellence of God or the Divine-human spiritual life given in Christ. Neither the idea of phusis, from phuo, nor that of Natura, from Nascor, comports with the unproduced and undeveloping absoluteness of God. Even Pantheism, which has introduced the two correlative ideas of NATURA NATURANS, or the sum of all things as producing, and NATURA NATURATA, the sum of all things as produced, nevertheless finds these ideas inconsistent with its high conception of the absolute ALL, and prefers the term SUBSTANCE. The Scripture, however, knows no such abstract terms as Essence or Substance. I AM IS BEING, indeed, in contradistinction to all phenomena; but it is Being concrete in an Eternal Person. SUBSTANCE, Substantia, which is the hidden reality that underlies attributes, is equally absent from Divine revelation. In theology the word Nature is generally referred equally to the eternal essence and to the moral character of God; the words Substance and Essence, however, are more appropriate to the former. It may be added, though apparently a refinement in thought, that being is a deeper word than existence—which by its derivation includes the EX, the coming out of being into definite manifestations, —and is therefore strictly the representative of the absolute essence of the Deity.

1 2 Peter 1:4.

2. Though the Divine names are alone mentioned, it must be remembered that there are other methods by which it has pleased God to present Himself to the thought of His creatures. Some Scriptural references to His being are neither names nor attributes: as when it is said that GOD IS SPIRIT; 1 that GOD IS LIGHT; 2 and that GOD IS LOVE. 3 But those definitions, mediating between essence and attribute, will find their appropriate place in a later department of theology.

1 John 4:24; 2 1 John 1:5; 3 1 John 4:16.

THEESSENTIAL NAMESOF GOD. The names which represent the unsearchable mystery of the Eternal have been progressively revealed. Two of them, Elohim and Jehovah, in their Old-Testament unity, declare that God is at once absolute and necessary being, and the personal Source and Giver of all Divine life: these are supreme among many other names running through the older revelation. They are continued in the New Testament and consummated by the disclosure of a Name without a name, that of the Triune God made known through the Incarnate Son: the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, the Holy Trinity.

ELOHIM AND JEHOVAH.

These two essential and personal names pervade the Scriptures as distinct, and as related to each other, and as combined with other names. They convey to the mind a representative idea of the Divine Being which, though standing for a reality unsearchable in itself, effectually defends it from every perversion of the notion of God.

1. The former elohiym, is the first and the pervading name of the Supreme Being in the early revelations, and in this form limited to it. Its derivation, whether traced to el, the more primitive type, signifying power, or to its singular eloahh, signifying the effect of power in fear, is of secondary importance: probably in its simplest root it is underived.

Occurring sometimes poetically in the singular, it is generally in the plural: thus expressing the abundance, fullness, and glory of the powers of the Divine nature: as it were intensive, or a plural of majesty; though, as always joined with the singular verb, it is not consistent with such an abstract Monotheism as would leave no place for the Scriptural doctrine of the Trinity.

2. The latter, Yhovah, denotes essential and absolute being, uniting what to man is past, present, and future in one eternal existence. This name is explained by God Himself: HE WHO IS, or HE WHO IS WHAT HE IS: 1 uniting as it were the abstract idea of pure Being with the process of continual becoming through revelation to His people. He is eternally steadfast in the perpetual revelation of His nature and relations. It is of importance to remember that Jehovah, no less than Elohim, lays the foundation of the doctrine of the Trinity. The historical development of the nature of God in Scripture is always connected with it: the Theophanies and Anthropomorphisms are always those of Jehovah. And Jesus the God manifest in the flesh 2 is Jehovah, the Angel of Jehovah3 in the Old Testament, even as He said of Himself, Before Abraham was IAmos 4:1-13 in the New Testament.

1 Exodus 3:14; 2 1 Timothy 3:16; 3 Exodus 3:2; 4 John 8:58.

3. These appellatives are united from the very beginning of Scripture; and their combination, the Lord God and God the Lord, declares the truth that the Elohim or God Who created the universe is the personal Jehovah or God of His creatures: therefore, when the fuller revelation was made through Moses, of the God of a special covenant, the personal relations of Jehovah Who had been known indeed from the beginning were made prominent over those of the Almighty God Whom the fathers had formerly known. When they are united, Elohim is rather the abstract and generic name, which might be given to false gods; but Jehovah is the proper name that indicates absolute unity, personality, and saving relation to His people and to individuals.

4. These are the two supreme names—given by Himself and not derived from heathenism—of the Divine Being in the Bible. All others are variations on them, or these with additional appellatives that link them with the attributes of the Godhead. For instance: El Shaday, God Almighty, 1 or Shaddai alone; the Living God; 2 Elohiym chayiym, the Most High; 3 El Elyown, the Lord, or the Lord God, of Hosts. 4 There is one name which occupies a peculiar place: the plural, Adonai, joined with Elohim and Jehovah. 5 This name of God denotes His dominion as Lord, which Jehovah does not. The Jews mostly used the vowel points of this word in writing and pronouncing the Name to them above every name, which they thus veiled in reverence: hence it coalesced with the latter when it was translated and passed into the New Testament as Kurios. The testimony of Thomas to the Divinity of Christ, My Lord and my God, 6 unites this with an echo of Adonai Elohai in the Psalms. St. John in the New Testament gives two new definitions of the nature of God, both, however, including His attributes, like those to which we have referred in the Old Testament: God is light and God is love. 7 The same final witness records the last revelation of God in the words of Christ which sums up these Divine names in one remarkable verse: Egoó eimi tó álfa kaí tó Oó légei Kúrios ho Theós hooón- kaí-ho-eén-kaí-ho-erchómenos ho Pantokrátoor. 8 Here are all the Greek representatives of the Hebrew names Elohim, Jehovah, Adonai, Shaddai; with their relation to absolute and personal being. And they form the transition, if our Lord Jesus Christ utters them, to the second branch of our subject, the final and full revelation of the Triune Name.

1 Genesis 17:1; 2 Job 5:17; 3 Genesis 14:18; 4 Jeremiah 5:14; Daniel 9:13; 5 Isaiah 40:10; 6 John 20:28; Psalms 35:23; 38:15; 7 1 John 1:5; 8 Revelation 1:8.

PROTEST OF THESE NAMES AGAINST ERROR. The two great perversions of thought concerning the Divine nature which have been found wherever men have been left to their own devices—Polytheism and Pantheism in all their forms —are by these names explained at once and condemned.

1. POLYTHEISM is the human corruption of these Divine truths: Elohim, the God of unbounded internal fullness of life and external manifestations of creative wealth, becomes in heathenism a universe of deified and worshipped powers; Jehovah in heathenism degenerates into the special and local imaginary god of each worshipping nation. Or, in the Eastern systems of Dualism, Elohim was perverted into the creative forces of darkness and evil, Jehovah into the co-eternal God of light and goodness. Holy Scripture distinctly refers to these corruptions of the truth, but only as corruptions. From beginning to end the Bible contains no acknowledgment of the reality of other gods. It is true that we read Jehovah is greater than all gods, 1 as the testimony of Jethro, a heathen, and who is like unto Thee, 0 Jehovah, among the gods? 2 in the song of Moses: as if declaring that no Elohim was above the Jewish Jehovah. But throughout Scripture the other gods are Vanities or Nothings. 3 It can hardly be denied however that according to the testimony of St. Paul, the Gentiles sacrifice to devils, daimonions, the saiyr 4 of the Old Testament, and therefore that evil spirits ruled over the empire of idolatry. But St. Paul, like all the ancient prophets, makes the false gods and their idols identical: both being nothing in the world. 5 The Lord our God is one Lord, 6 and His name one, 7 and the only true God. 8This is the sublime testimony of the opening of Genesis, and it is confirmed throughout revelation. The Pantheon of heathenism has its altar; but that altar is erected to cuwniy, that which is not god.9

1 Exodus 25:11; Exodus 22:3; 2 Exodus 28:11; 3 Deuteronomy 32:21; 4 1 Corinthians 8:4; Deuteronomy 32:17; 5 1 Corinthians 8:4; 6 Deuteronomy 6:4; 7 Zec. 19:9; 8 John 17:3; 9 Deuteronomy 32:21.

2. PANTHEISM has in every age—in the East and West, in ancient and in modern times— been the prevalent error of the philosophical intelligence in its speculations on this high subject. Unlike Polytheism, it has aimed to simplify the idea of the Supreme; but its simplification reduces Him to the ALL, to pan kai to en, the unity of the world, or the UNIVERSE. As such Pantheism makes God the sum of things in the sense of elevating Him above personality. The ancient Pantheism, as introduced into the modern world by Spinoza, regards the All as one substance, having mind and extension as its modes or attributes. There is no becoming; all is pure being; and phenomena are only the modifications of that being. Whatever the transcendental philosophy has superinduced on this notion, resolving pure being finally into the unmodified NOTHING, of which no limiting attribute can be predicated, has no element in common with Biblical theology.

Modern Materialism unconsciously adopts a Pantheistic character. Its unknown and unknowable Force or Law is the irrational expression of the same thought; it only gives matter the pre-eminence in its philosophy of Nescience.

3. ELOHIM-JEHOVAH is the Scriptural doctrine, expressed in symbolical names, which protests against both perversions. However difficult it may be to receive it, God is the one Absolute Personality. This is the teaching of both names, especially in their union. Each denotes the soleness, the necessity, the infinity of the Divine Being as a Spiritus Independens; and each is connected with man and the creature in such a way as not only to permit, but to demand, the most definite personality, or self-determining relation to the beings whom He calls into existence. This double name expresses clearly all that Pantheism has labored in vain to express during the course of its many evolutions; but for ever precludes the error into which Pantheism has fallen. It avows an infinite fullness of life and possibility in the eternal essence; but assigns all to the controlling will of a Person. The Scripture scarcely ever approaches the notion of an abstract entity; it invariably makes both Elohim and Jehovah the subjects of endless predicates and predicative ascriptions. In Him we live, and move, and have our being: in Him, 1 a Person to be sought unto and found. In fact, the personality of God, as a Spirit of self-conscious and self-determining and independent individuality, is as deeply stamped upon His revelation of Himself as is His existence. We are created in His image: our Archetype has in eternal reality the being which we possess as shadows of Him; He has in eternal truth the personality which we know to be our own characteristic, though we hold it in fealty from Him. THY GOD is the Divine word; MY GOD, the human response, through the pages of revelation. No subtlety of modern philosophy has ever equaled the definition of the absolute I AM; the English words give the right meaning of the original only when it lays the stress upon the AM for the essential being, and the I for the personality of that being.

1 Acts 17:28.

4. The same correction may be traced throughout the long succession of names which are given to the Deity in the Old Testament: the gradual development seems to show that the error, in both its forms, but especially the Polytheistic, was confronted more and more fully from age to age. The variations which were gradually introduced are all connected with appendages that guard the majesty of the one God. When the name Jehovah was made prominent as the covenant-name for

His own people, certain peculiarities in its use taught important lessons. Neither the people nor any individual might say, MY Jehovah: it was enough to say MY Elohim, or Jehovah, my Lord. Nor do we ever read of THE Jehovah, as if He were or might be one of many. The Scripture often speaks of the living God, 1 as if in opposition to the gods which are dead nothings. But it never speaks of the living Jehovah; though it is very frequent to make the eternal life of Jehovah the highest oath: as the Lord liveth! 2 Very much importance has been attached to the laws which regulate the use of Elohim and Jehovah respectively; and one of these laws will be found by careful observation to be the assertion of the unity of the God of the whole earth, and His peculiar relation to the entire race of mankind as the God of a covenant of redemption yet to be revealed. After all, the profound and glorious rebuke of all Polytheistic and Pantheistic errors is the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. And this Jehovah-Elohim prepares for in many ways. The plural Elohim name lays the indefinite and mysterious foundation for a plurality of Persons in the Godhead; while the singular Jehovah for ever guards the unity of God. The absolute soleness of Deity is maintained by the immutable name Jehovah; while, at the same time, it is that very name which is linked with every Old-Testament manifestation of the Three Persons, and is continued in the New-Testament revelation of the Three-One Jehovah, the Father the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

1 Joshua 3:10; 2 Numbers 14:21.

09. Vol 01 - The Triune Name

The Triune Name THE TRIUNE NAME THE DIVINE UNITY

Polytheism;

Pantheism THE TRINITY AND TRIUNITY Development in Scripture ECCLESIASTICAL DEVELOPMENT:

Ante-Nicene;

Sabellianism;

Subordinationism and Principatus of the Father;

Arianism; The Creeds; The Councils:

Mediaeval;

Reformation;

Modern Errors;

Practical Conclusions The perfect revelation of the Divine Name or Essence is that which is given by our Lord Himself in the Baptismal Formula of dedication to God and admission into His kingdom. This final testimony of the Revealer declares that the supreme Object of Christian Faith is one, yet existing in a threefold internal personality. As a testimony, it closes a long series of progressive developments of doctrine, all pointing to a Trinity of personal subsistences in the Godhead; and commences a revelation of God which connects Three Divine Persons with the creation of all things, the redemption of the world, and the administration of grace in the Church. Hence, a doctrinal distinction may be suggested between the Absolute or Immanent Trinity and the Trinity Economical or Redemptional. The latter must be reserved for a future stage. It is with the former that we have now to do; and it will be sufficient to establish from Scripture the essential Unity, the essential Trinity, and the essential Triunity of the Divine Being. This will lead finally to a further illustration of the doctrine by a reference to the controversies through which it has passed, and the dogmatic definitions to which these have given rise. THE DIVINE UNITY.

It is impossible to define the Unity of God: the word unity in human language gives no adequate notion, barely serving to defend the doctrine from every opposite error. Hence it is our wisdom to study it in the light of its exhibition in Scripture: marking the uses to which the doctrine is applied, the Scriptural method of stating it, and the confirmations of the truths which may be everywhere found in the one and uniform economy of nature.

DOCTRINE OF SCRIPTURE.

Consulting God’s own revelation of His unity it is very instructive to observe the forms the doctrine assumes there.

1. It is set forth as the basis of all worship: of devotion and obedience and fear. Hear, 0 Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. 1 This demands a perfect consecration which by the very terms only One Object can claim. Know therefore this day, and consider it in thine heart, that the Lord He is God in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath: there is none else. Thou shalt keep therefore His statutes. 2 Here supreme obedience is exacted to one sole Authority which can have no rival. There is no God with Me: I kill, and I make alive: I wound, and I heal: neither is there any that can deliver out of My hand. For I lift up My hand to heaven, and say, I live for ever. 3 There is only one Judge to be reverenced and feared for time and for eternity.

1 Deuteronomy 6:4-5; 2 Deuteronomy 4:39-40; 3 Deuteronomy 32:39-40.

2. It is often urged as the protest of the Supreme against false views of His nature; especially in those parts of Scripture where Divine revelation comes into collision with heathenism. Against the polytheistic creed and idolatrous practice of the nations the one God appeals: Is there a God beside Me? yea, there is no God; I know not any. 1 Everywhere, down to St. Paul's testimony, We know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but One, 2 the One Being, Who asserts, but does not prove, His own existence, asserts without proving His absolute unity. Against Dualism, the belief, not known by name in Scripture, which has taken refuge in the notion of two co-eternal elements of being, passively co-existent or struggling for mastery, the Eternal more than once commands His prophets to deliver His own testimony. Having its origin in Persia, this notion passed through later Judaism into the heretical sects of Gnosticism, and spent itself out in Manichaeism. The God of Israel condescends to utter His protest against this, perhaps the most natural and widespread of all errors: I am the Lord, and there is none else. I form the light, and create darkness. 3 Here the very terminology of earlier and later Dualism is used; but it is only to declare that no independent origin of evil must be conceived. It may be impossible for the human mind to understand how He in whom there is no darkness at all 4 could nevertheless create darkness. The only answer is, there is none else. But darkness and light are also to be under-stood by what follows, I make peace, and create evil. 5 The One God is the Abolisher of sin by His peace, and its Punisher by His evil. Against Pantheism, which perverts the doctrine of the Divine unity by making God the sum of all personalities and forces, but not Himself a distinct personality, the Supreme testified: He that planted the ear, shall He not hear? He that formed the eye, shall He not see? 6 This is an apostrophe to the ungodly in the form of an appeal to the One Judge; but it is the Lord's own refutation of Pantheism in all its future or possible forms. Still more expressly, however, is the true unity of God opposed to this system of false unity in all those passages which speak of the, One Creator of all things: I am the Lord that maketh all things; that stretch-eth forth the heavens alone; that spreadeth abroad the earth by Myself. 7 1 Isaiah 44:8; 2 1 Corinthians 8:4; 3 Isaiah 14:6-7; 4 1 John 1:5; 5 Isaiah 14:6-7; 6 Psalms 94:9; 7 Isaiah 44:24.

3. In real consistency with all this, though in seeming discord, is the undeniable fact that in many references to the Divine unity there is an undertone of mysterious allusion to a plurality of Persons within the Godhead. St. Paul, in the Epistle which declares the mystery of God manifest in the flesh, proclaims that: there is One God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, or Jesus Christ,Man 1:1 And, in the final revelations of our Lord, He asserts His Divinity in the very words which bespeak in the Old Testament the unity of God: I am the First and I am the Last: 2 we may add here also, Beside Me, there is no God. This is more fully seen when we go

back to the ancient words: Thus saith the Lord the King of Israel, and His Redeemer the Lord of Hosts; I am the First, and I am the Last; and beside Me there is no God. 3 That the oneness or soleness of the Divine essence is consistent with an interior intercommunion of persons is a truth which faith must receive. Human reason is unable to grasp it. It is the mystery of God, 4 parallel with the mystery of Christ. 5 Christianity is not in conflict with Judaism in this essential principle of the earliest revelation. Even in this it is Monotheistic.

1 1 Timothy 3:16; 2:5; 2 Revelation 1:17; Isaiah 44:6; 3 Colossians 2:2; 4 Ephesians 3:4.

4. Lastly, it is asserted in connection with the doctrine of the Trinity, a combination of the utmost importance. When our Lord has unfolded in His paschal discourse the relations of the Three Persons, and immediately before He asks for the glory which I had with Thee before the world was, 1 He declares This is life eternal, to know Thee, the only true God.2 He gives the abiding formula of the Faith in Three Persons as baptism into the ONE NAME.

1 John 17:3-5; 2 Matthew 28:19.

EXTRA SCRIPTURAL.

It might seem, after what has been said, superfluous to appeal for confirmation to arguments extra-Biblical: especially as it is almost impossible to abstract ourselves for a moment from the prepossessions which the Scripture has interwoven into all our habitual notions of the Divine Being.

1. The human mind is so constituted as to be unable to conceive of more than one Absolute Being. The same sure instinct of manor constitution of his nature, which prepares him for the disclosure of God is unable to endure more gods than one: the foundation or source of all being cannot, without contradiction, be multiplied. Unity is not an attribute of Deity, not a quality of essence so much as a condition of relation: the Supreme is related to His interior Self, and to His creatures, but as God, is unrelated. The primary law of thought that predicates the Infinite and the Absolute of the Divine Being demands His eternal unity as a necessary postulate.

2. The term is used only by analogy. Though there is one Divine nature, the unity of God is not a unity of kind, because there are not individuals of the same species; and, therefore, as for other reasons, the word is inapplicable to the Divinity. Of all other objects of thought we can imagine fellows or reproductions. But in God there is absolute soleness, SOLEITAS; though what lies hidden in the mystery of this essential ONENESS we know but partially. It is wrong to dogmatise upon the nature of a unity to which we have no parallel, and which we cannot define by comparison or illustration.

3. The constitution of nature, both physical and moral, confirms this doctrine by innumerable evidences. Unity is stamped upon the entire creation: so clearly that the whole system of science is based upon this presupposition; its latest conclusions pointing to some one primitive and central force, which some in their blind enthusiasm almost deify as the unknown God. And, as it is in earthly things, so it is in things spiritual and heavenly. There is one conscience in man, suggesting one law and one Lawgiver. There is evil, as there is good; but they both pay homage to the supreme Will behind them, which is their equal standard. Hence, the erring philosophy of the world, in the better tendencies of its error, has seldom been Polytheistic or Dualistic: its universal

tendency towards Pantheism declares its indestructible conviction of the Unity of God. This has been its snare, to carry the principle to the extreme of denying all personality or creaturely existence outside of the One and the All. THE TRINITY OF THE GODHEAD. The Christian faith receives and adores the mystery that the One Divine Essence exists in a Trinity of coequal, personal Subsistence: related as the Father, the eternal Son of the Father, and the Holy Spirit eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son. In the baptismal formula our Lord has presented to Faith the name and nature of God in its perfect revelation. The commission of the Apostles was to convert all nations from idolatry, and to bring them to the Gospel salvation: that salvation was to be obtained in the economy of redemption, through faith in the One Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, 1 to which all worship must henceforth be offered. Christian baptism is to be administered into the Name, eis to onoma, into the NEW NAME: not names as of many, but Name as of one. Yet the repeated kai, and of, declares a spiritual distinction in the Godhead as the Object of faith, trust, hope and full devotion: for baptism meant all this and nothing less. Men were not to be called to believe in God and two subordinate gods: that would have been only the introduction of a new form of Polytheism. Yet not in God, and a Mediator, and an Influence: the names Son and Holy Ghost are not, the former especially, simply names of office. But this great text, though central and fundamental, does not stand alone. It must be viewed as the consummation of preliminary and imperfect disclosures; as involving and sealing the Scriptural doctrine, otherwise revealed, of the Deity of the Two Persons called the Son and the Holy Spirit; and as the standard for the interpretation of later Trinitarian passages in the New Testament: that is, it must be viewed first as looking backward to a long development, then in itself and its own meaning, and finally as looking forward to the later Apostolical Scriptures.

1 Matthew 28:19.

DEVELOPMENT IN SCRIPTURE. The doctrine of the Trinity, like every other, had, in the mystery of the Divine education of the Church, its slow development. Remembering the law that the progress of Old- Testament doctrine must be traced in the light of the New Testament, we can discern throughout the ancient records a pre-intimation of the Three-One, ready to be revealed in the last time. 1 No word in the ancient records is to be studied as standing alone; but according to the analogy of faith, which is no other than the one truth that reigns in the organic whole of Scripture.

1 Peter 1:5.

1. The first distant hint of plurality, Let Us makeMan 1:1 is the plurality of Three: God, and the Word by Whom all things were made, 2 and the Spirit of God Who moved on the face of the waters, 3 brooding over the Chaos. The occasional triple manifestations to the Patriarchs, as when the Lord appeared unto Abraham, and, lo, three men stood by him, 4 also yield their suggestions, if no more.

1 Genesis 1:26; 2 John 1:3; 3 Gen. 1:1.2; 4 Genesis 18:1-2.

2. But there is more than mere suggestion in the Benediction and the Doxology of the ancient Temple: the former literal, the latter symbolical, both belonging to God alone by the very terms. Blessing may be bestowed by a creature as the agent or instrument of Him Who alone can bless; but whenever the word is thus used in Scripture there is plain indication that it is only ministerial. It

is the highest prerogative of the Supreme to pronounce blessings upon His people. So also tributes of honor may be paid to exalted creatures; but God alone is the object of doxology. The former of these distinctions is illustrated by the Levitical office of benediction. The priests were commanded to put THE NAME of Jehovah upon the people and bless them, 1 in the utterance of a three-one benediction which, as we shall see, the Apostolic form echoes in the New Temple and expounds. 2 So the response of the Doxology in the mystical temple, by the angelic choir if not by man, cries Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of Hosts! 3 Behind the veil the Divine glory disparts into three, while all the disparted rays blend again into one.

1 Numbers 6:27; 2 2 Corinthians 8:14; 3 Isaiah 6:3.

3. The prophecies concerning the Mediatorial Ministry assume a form explicable only by the New-Testament doctrine: My mouth it hath commanded, and His Spirit it hath gathered them. 1 He who proclaimed Hear, 0 Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord, 2 cries once more: Hear ye this: I have not spoken in secret from the beginning, 3 — though My full Name hath not been known—from the time that it was, there am I: and now— anticipating the fullness of time—the LORD GOD and His SPIRIT hath sent ME. Of Whom doth the Prophet, or rather the voice of God Himself, speak this? Prophecy could not retain its veiled and mystic character, and speak more plainly than in such terms as these. The same mysterious Trinity may be traced elsewhere in the prophets.

1 Isa. 39:16; 2 Deuteronomy 6:4; 3 Isaiah 48:16.

4. When the Old Testament blends with the New in the preliminaries of the Incarnation, both the songs that herald it and the Incarnation itself declare the Triune God: the Holy Ghost Who is the Power of the Highest 1 overshadows the mother of our Lord; and His Incarnation-name is Immanuel, God with us, 2 Who should be, and should be called the Son of God.

1 Luke 1:35; 2 Matthew 1:23.

5. Until the Resurrection permitted the full unsealing of the revelation of our Lord’s relations to His Father, His teaching generally was intermediate between the two Testaments: a principle that is not enough remembered in Biblical theology. His exposition of every doctrine which was afterwards distinctive in the New Faith illustrates this. We must, however, limit our view to that of the Holy Trinity. This Jesus taught by degrees most fully and clearly: partly as manifested in His personal history, and partly by His express words. At the beginning of His ministry the Sacred Three are revealed around His own Person in connection with His Baptism; and in His farewell discourse on the eve of His passion He expanded the full significance of that revelation of which He had been the centre. The former introduces the Father, acknowledging the Son and sealing Him by the Spirit symbolically, preluding the baptism ordained for His people. The latter is the Savior’s complete doctrine of the Trinity, showing that the future Presence of God in His Church, collectively and in its individual members, would be the inhabitation of the Father, His Son, and His personal Spirit. This was the final preparation for the baptismal formula. THE BAPTISMAL FORMULA. This fundamental text, which knows of no variations of reading, unites two Persons with the Father in a manner of which there is no example elsewhere in Scripture. It is unique and alone: a dignity becoming the Revealer of the new Name, the revelation of the mystery itself, and the transcendent solemnity of its relation to the Christian economy.

This, therefore, is the place for the consideration of what these names import in relation to the Holy Trinity. It must be shown briefly that these Three Persons, or rather the Second and Third, are in this Formula truly Divine; and the best method of accomplishing this will be once more to regard these words as dividing between a past imperfect revelation and the fuller revelation given in Christ concerning Himself and His Spirit in the unity of the Father. THE SECOND AND THIRD PERSONS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. The Older Revelation contains references to the Son and the Spirit of God which, when the light of the New Testament is shed upon them, plainly declare the distinct Divine personality of both in the unity of the Godhead. We need not pause to ask why the name Father is not given to the Deity in the Old Testament. It is not unknown there. Almost the last appeal of Jehovah against His people—His son whom He called out of Egypt1 —was: If I then be a Father, where is Mine honor? 2 But it was reserved to be brought out in its depth and fullness by His Eternal Son.

1 Hosea 9:1; 2 Malachi 1:6.

1. The Second Person is almost as familiar a Presence in the Old Testament as in the New: that is, when it is searched in the light of His own testimony concerning its witness to Himself. At sundry times and in divers manners 1 He appeared; but always in such a form as rejects every interpretation but that of His equality with Jehovah, as being God and not a creation of God. His manifestations were precisely consistent with His twofold relation, pretemporal and incarnate, to the Trinity. As the Eternal Image of His Father's Person, He is Jehovah Himself, yet distinct from Jehovah: in sublime consistency with His true nature. But, as anticipating His mediatorial character, He is the ANGEL OF JEHOVAH, or the ANGEL OF ELOHIM, from the earliest dawn down to Malachi, where He is the ANGEL OF THE COVENANT. By Myself have I sworn, saith Jehovah . . . that in blessing I will bless thee. JEHOVAH-JIREH who gave to Abraham the great Benediction was the Angel of the Lord. The Angel who wrestled with Jacob was to him God face to face;2 as He was also to Hosea: He found him in Bethel, and there He spake with us; even Jehovah, God of Hosts; Jehovah is His memorial. 3 One other testimony must stand for a long series: Behold, I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of Him, and obey His voice, provoke Him not: for He will not pardon your transgressions; for MY NAME is IN HIM. 4 Who can fail to think of the Coming Redeemer, so like this Old-Testament Joshua, and as the New-Testament Jesus so unlike! Throughout the Gospels, from Gabriel's testimony to the Angel greater than he downwards, there is no question that the Jehovah-Angel is Jehovah Himself, and that Jehovah Himself reappears in the name LORD, very often though not exclusively. Not Esaias alone, but all the Old-Testament writers, saw His glory and spake of Him. 5 But the uncreated Minister of Jehovah's will is not generally in the Old Testament foreannounced as the Son, any more than Jehovah is revealed as the Father.

This, however, is not quite wanting. The link that connects the ANGEL OF THE FACE in the ancient with THE SON in the later Scripture is threefold. He is in Psalms 6:1-10 and Prophecy 7 termed THE SON expressly, the WORD or ORACLE of God or hypostatised WISDOM; and He is called ADONAI or LORD, 8 the MIGHTY GOD. 9 But these more occasional testimonies flow into a general representation of the future Messiah; and as such they must be reserved for the fuller exhibition of the Mediatorial Trinity, and the Person of Christ.

1 Hebrews 1:1; 2 Genesis 32:30; 3 Hosea 12:4-5; 4 Exodus 23:20-21; 5 John 12:41; 6 Psalms 2:7; 7 Proverbs 8:23; 8 Psalms 110:5; 9 Isaiah 7:14; 9:6.

2. The presence of the Third Person equally pervades the Old Testament, as one with God and yet personally distinct in the mystery of the Divine essence. The Spirit of God 1 is active with the Word in creation: By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made: and all the host of them by the Breath of His mouth. 2 The Spirit of God hath made me, and the Breath of the Almighty hath given me life.3 He is no less active in providence: My Spirit shall not always strive with [or rule in] man; 4 in whose renewed heart he dwells: take not Thy Holy Spirit from me.5 His energy was felt in the inspiration of the prophets.

Joseph was, by Pharaoh's testimony, a man in whom the Spirit of God is. 6 And when the Spirit of God rested upon them they prophesied. 7 Upon Samson, and many others, it is said that the Spirit of the Lord came mightily. 8 David bore witness: The Spirit of the Lord spake by me. 9 He is omnipresent and omniscient: Whither shall I go from, Thy Spirit? 10 The presence of God is the presence of the Holy Ghost. And yet He is distinguished from the Lord Himself, as One whom He hath sent and will send to man. Is the Spirit of the Lord straitened? The Lord God, and His Spirit, hath sent Me. As the Messiah is promised to the world, so also is the Spirit. I will pour out My Spirit upon all flesh. 11 And in the New Testament, the fulfillment of the Promise of the Father is an event equal in glory with the Incarnation. As the Angel of the past becomes now the Incarnate Son, so the Spirit of the past becomes the personal Holy Ghost. The hour of Both Persons is fully come.

1 Genesis 1:2; 2 Psalms 33:4; 3 Job 33:4; 4 Genesis 41:38; 5 Numbers 11:25; 6 Judges 14:6; 7 2 Samuel 23:2; 8 Psalms 139:7; 9 Micah 2:7; 10 Isaiah 49:16; 11 Joel 2:28. THE SON AND THE SPIRIT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. In the New-Testament testimonies to the Son and to the Holy Ghost, these, the names of Divine and eternal Persons, are so related to each other and to the Father as to establish, by the fullest and most abundant evidence, the doctrine which has received the dogmatic definition of THE HOLY TRINITY.

1. There is nothing in the Savior's revelation more clear, nothing more interwoven with all His teaching, than His annunciation of the new name of FATHER as related to Himself in a sense unshared: unto MY FATHER, and your Father. 1 This has its highest expression in the baptismal formula where He is eternally related to the Father as His Son. He is the ONLY-BEGOTTEN, toú monogenoús Huioú, This is first declared by St. John, in express relation to His absolute existence in THE FATHER: ho oón eis tón kólpon toú Patrós, which is in the bosom of the Father, and pará toú Patrós, of or from the Father, to be compared with prós tón Theón, said of the Son as the WORD or LOGOS. 2 These three prepositions, pros, para, eis, are one in their only true meaning: a trinity of particles carefully chosen to express an unfathomable mystery, which they cannot explain, though they may serve to protect it from perversion. Afterwards our Lord proves to us that this eternal name, though retained in His incarnation, was not derived from His incarnation: God GAVE His Only-begottenSong of Solomon 3:1-11 which, in the only other instance of the use of the term, is strengthened by the express connection with it of apéstalken; God SENT His Only begottenSong of Solomon 4:1-16 The Jews understood Jesus to be making Himself equal with God when He said that God was His proper and peculiar Father, Patéra ídion. 5 The Holy Spirit gave this same word to St. Paul: He spared not His own Son, toú idíou Huioú. 6 Of this Son, the

Son of His love, it is said that He is the Image of the invisible God, the Firstborn before every creature, prootótokos, not prootoktiotos, not first-created but first-begotten: before all things, and by Him all things consist. 7 He is the Effulgence of His glory, and the Very Image of His substance. 8 Our Lord's last prayer sums up the whole argument: And now, 0 Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine own Self—pará seautoó, 9 in express contradistinction from the world or earth in which His mission was—with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was, pará soi. Here are all the elements of the doctrine of the ETERNAL SONSHIP, which is sufficient to establish the relation of the Son to the Father as the Second Person in the Holy Trinity.

1 John 20:17; 2 John 1:14; 3 John 3:16; 4 1 John 4:9; 5 John 5:9; 6 Romans 8:32; 7 Colossians 1:13; Colossians 1:16-17; 8 Hebrews 1:3; 9 John 17:5.

2. THE HOLY GHOST is a DIVINE PERSON, distinct from the Father and the Son. To establish this, we need only to examine our Lord's words, and collate with them the ample and various testimonies of the entire New Testament.

(1.) The Son is the Revealer of the Third Person, as well as of the Father. His final Trinitarian Discourse—for such is the character of the Paschal Farewell—has left no question on this subject unsolved: before He was glorified by the Spirit, He glorified the Spirit Himself, by establishing the first principles of His personality, Divinity, and eternal relations in the Godhead. The pronoun HE, EKEÍNOS, is applied to One who is another Comforter. 1 The PERSONALITY of the Holy Ghost governs the Lord's entire strain, and must interpret those many passages in which by metonymy the influences of the Spirit's operation are identified with Himself. It is impossible to read carefully in their context these sayings concerning the Coming Spirit without feeling that the idea of a personification is a most hopeless expedient. Whether Divine or not, a Person was foreannounced, as certainly as it was a Person whom Moses predicted as the coming prophet. But the DEITY of the Third Person is declared as that of an eternal procession from the Father. When the Comforter is come WHOM I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father HE SHALL TESTIFY of Me. 2 Here the TEMPORAL MISSION is clearly distinguished from the ETERNAL PROCESSION.

Between the two futures, marked by WHOM and HE, the pronoun which enters as a parenthetical reference to the essential eternal relation, hó pará toú Patrós ekporeúetai: PROCEEDETH, not shall proceed, in an ETERNAL PRESENT, the pará being precisely the same as the pará Patrós of the Only-begotten, 3 while the neuter hó is parallel with Hó eén ap archeés, spoken of the Eternal Son, that Which was from the beginning. 4 These parallels must not be passed lightly over, but carefully pondered. The Savior does not say that this procession is from the Son as well as from the Father. But, reading on, we mark these memorable words: All things that the Father hath are Mine: therefore said I, that He shall take of Mine, and shall show it unto you. 5 The Spirit's glorification of Christ extends to His Person as well as to His work, indeed, rather to His Person than His work; and it was from His sacred Person that the Lord breathed on 6 the Apostles the Holy Ghost. Hence this supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ 7 is imparted in the symbol of a personal spiration or breathing; and the name SPIRIT may be regarded as sanctioning the faith that the Third Person PROCEEDETH FROM THE FATHER AND THE SON, —to anticipate the language of the early Creeds and later Confessions of Christendom—though the Son in His humiliation mentions only the Father. But on this topic more hereafter.

1 John 16:13; 19:16,17; 2 John 15:26; 3 John 1:14; 4 1 John 1:1; 5 John 16:15; 6 John 20:22; 7 Php 1:19.

(2.) Reserving for a future section the operations and influences of the Holy Ghost, we have only to indicate that the whole of the New Testament is true to the Revealer's teaching on this subject. The Personality and Deity of the Spirit shine everywhere through the veil of the Mediatorial work, which to a certain extent hides the Trinitarian relations of the Second and the Third Persons alike. The humiliation of the Son Incarnate has its parallel, though after another manner, in the humiliation of the Holy Ghost, While we hear, He hath shed forth THIS, 1 we read also that the Holy Ghost said, Separate ME Barnabas and Saul. 2 The first hypocrites in the Acts are said to have lied to the Holy Ghost, and therefore to have lied not unto men but to God. 3 In the Epistles to the Corinthians, which dwell so much on the dispensation of the Spirit, St. Paul declares that we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God: 4 where ek toú Theoú, varies the phrase in a very significant manner, as it were expressly distinguishing between the evil spiritual influence breathed by the world and the Substantial Spirit coming out from the Deity. That same Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God; 5 thus being essentially personal and Divine. These testimonies are enough for our present purpose, which is to show the relation of the Third, as well as of the Second Person, to the ONE NAME into which Christians are baptised.

1 Acts 2:33; 2 Acts 13:2; 3 Acts 5:3-4; 4 1 Corinthians 2:12; 5 1 Corinthians 2:10.

APOSTOLICAL TESTIMONIES. The later testimonies to the Holy Trinity literally pervade the New Testament. They will require to be considered when we come to the Mediatorial Ministry, and the peculiar aspect in which it places our doctrine. Meanwhile, it is sufficient to indicate generally the bearing of these testimonies, illustrating them by leading examples. It must be premised, however, first, that here also there is a certain development in the revelation, and, secondly, that they are introduced not so much to explain the Trinity Economical as to point out the proof of an Absolute Trinity underlying this as its necessary foundation.

1. In the Acts the publication of the Gospel is connected with the Holy Trinity, though under an aspect suited to the times of preparation. For, there is still evidence after Pentecost of the same law of gradual development which reigned before. The doctrine in this historical book is not fully revealed to those who were not yet prepared to receive it: at least, not until they were fully prepared. When we read St. Peter's testimony before the Council, 1 and St. Paul's in his several missionary discourses, 2 we must remember that the Three Persons whom they invariably introduce are the same of Whom the Lord had spoken before He departed, and of Whom these Preachers afterwards more clearly wrote in their Epistles.

1 Acts 5:1-42; 2 Acts 8:1-40.

2. The Mediatorial Economy, that is, the entire system of man's return to fellowship with God, is always described in harmony with this doctrine. For through Him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father: 1 this great word is the key to the general strain of the Epistles, and, if pursued into its consequences, is sufficient to establish the Divinity of each Person. It is utterly inconceivable that admission to the presence and knowledge and acceptance of God could be given by any creatures as such. But this will be made more emphatic when we consider that the mediatorial economy leads to union with the Deity, which, whether regarded as our being in God,

or God being in us, is the highest blessedness of the creature. To be filled unto all the fullness of God is in the Ephesian prayer the result of being strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man, that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith. 2 Here, to the believing eye at least, is the INDWELLING TRINITY. Nor can any candid mind resist this conclusion when other passages which do not unite the Three Persons are collated: those namely which speak of Christ in you, the hope of glory; 3 of our body as being a temple of the Holy Ghost Which is in you; 4 and many others which will be referred to more fully when the Economical Trinity is the subject. Suffice now to observe that it is the prerogative of God alone to dwell in His creatures; that to the Father, the Son, and the Spirit distinctively and equally this prerogative is assigned; and that to no other beings or persons is it ascribed throughout the Scriptures. No principle is more universal than this.

1 Ephesians 2:18; 2 Ephesians 3:16-19; 3 Colossians 1:27; 4 1 Corinthians 6:19.

3. The impartation of the Divine influences on which personal salvation and the work of the Gospel depend is invariably connected with the Three Persons. Generally it is invoked from God in the unity of this Trinity: The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. 1 This clearly answers to the priestly benediction, with its general blessing, the grace of mercy and the effect of peace; though the order is changed under the dispensation of the Son and Spirit. But all benediction, like all power, IS OF GOD. 2 More particularly we see the same relation to the Trinity in the dispensation of the special gifts: their diversities are of the same Spirit; their administration is of the same Lord; their operation of the same God. 3 It must be remembered that the graces and gifts of the Gospel are besought in prayer; and are, especially throughout St. Paul’s prayers, so besought as to show that the appeal is to each Person in the Trinity in the unity of the Godhead. These examples introduce the Three Persons; but they may be confirmed by some others, though their number is not great, which seek grace from each Person respectively.

1 2 Corinthians 13:14; 2 Romans 13:1; 3 1 Corinthians 12:4-6.

4. The Apocalypse in its symbolical imagery closes the New Testament with its peculiar but evident tribute to the Holy Trinity. The Incarnate Son, Whose grace is invoked, is the First and the Last, and the Lamb in the midst of the throne: 1 there is no honor paid the Eternal which He does not share. The Seven Spirits before, His throne, 2 in the midst of which is the Incarnate Lamb—like no other among the ministering sevens—are or is invoked also as the Giver of Grace. The unity of the Holy Trinity has no clearer expression in Scripture. This Sevenfold or all-holy Spirit is distinct from the Lamb, 3 yet one with Him; and one also with God. And the perfect homage of this book, disguised as it is in symbols, returns in its form and language to the mystical worship of the ancient Temple.

It is the adoration of the Triune God: Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, Which was, and is, and is to come; 4 and thus indicates the profound truth that the supreme praise of Paradise, though not forgetting the distinction of Persons, needs no mention of their Personal names. And here we have an illustration of the great saying of the Apostle, used in relation to the end of the Mediatorial ministry, but inexhaustible in its meaning, that God may be all in all.5 1 Revelation 22:13; 7:17; 2 Revelation 1:4; 3 Revelation 5:6; 4 Revelation 4:8; 5 1 Corinthians 15:28. THE DIVINE TRIUNITY.

Neither the term Trinity, nor any that expresses the notion of Triunity, is contained in Scripture. But the mysterious truth that these words represent is stamped upon the entire revelation of God, which, implicitly in the Old Testament, and explicitly in the New, bears witness to a Divine Triad. The Lord our God is one Lord; yet there are Three that bear witness in heaven, and these Three are One: words which we can use for purpose, though they may be excluded from the text of Holy Scripture. The term Triunity we might make the verbal symbol of our faith. It guards us—and in this case there is no more that words can do—against the perversions to which the true doctrine is liable. These perversions are manifold. The unity may be so emphasized as to reduce the Trinity to three manifestations of the One God, successive but in different modes. Or the Trinity may be so incautiously apprehended as to commit the thought to the notion of three independent Divine Beings. Or, the Godhead being wrongly regarded as the unknown essence behind the Persons, four Gods may be the consequence. Or a compromise may be effected by introducing the notion of One God, the Fountain of Deity, and two beings of the same nature derived from Him. The transition is then easy to the notion of two inferior beings issuing from the Divinity, with not only a derived and subordinate, but also a created, Deity. These various errors are known in theology by the names of Sabellianism, Tritheism, Tetratheism, Subordinationism, and Arianism respectively. They will be exhibited briefly in the following historical review; but it may be premised that the first and the last are the two salient forms of heresy or of heretical speculation on this subject; that is, concerning the Godhead regarded as a Trinity. It may be added, moreover, that they do not occur in modern systems always with these names: being often disguised, and that in the most subtle manner. The first especially enters into many modes of theological thought which know nothing of the name Sabellian. The second colors much theology which is not conscious of its own tendency. The third, Tetratheism, has hardly ever existed, save as the logical inference from other errors. Subordinationism may be made consistent with the truth.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT.

It may be said that the history of all human opinion concerning the Supreme has been, in some sense, a record of the struggles of speculation towards this adorable mystery, or of its endeavors to grasp and formulate it as revealed. Pantheism and Dualism both tended towards it in the East; and no form of Polytheism has been altogether without some trace of it. But this is emphatically true of the history of the doctrine concerning God as developed in the Christian Church.

ANTE-NICENE. The ante-Nicene Church held the doctrine of the Divine Trinity, though in an undogmatic form. The advocates of a permanent ecclesiastical authority deciding the doctrines of the Faith, whether by tradition or development, have joined the Rationalists and antiTrinitarians in exaggerating the indefiniteness of the early statements of this truth. But the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, and of the Apologists, at least faithfully reproduce the tone of the New Testament; and a catena of their testimonies may be given which will prove that they made a large advance towards later definitions. All forms of the early Creeds direct Christian faith to Three Persons. Their doxologies bear clear witness: as that of Polycarp, "I glorify Thee, through the Eternal High Priest, Jesus Christ, Thy beloved Son, through Whom be glory to Thee with Him in the Holy Ghost, both now and for ever." Athenagoras asks, "Why are we called atheists, speaking as we do of the Father as God, and the Holy Ghost; showing both Their power in unity and Their distinction in order?" and says again, "The Father and the Son are One: the Son is in the Father, and the Father in the Son, by the unity and power of the Spirit." Theophilus of Antioch gives us the

term " Triad, God, His Word, and His Wisdom," a term used after him by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Hippolytus, and by Tertullian and Novatian changed into Trinitas.

Tertullian’s language is very expressive: " All Three are One by unity of substance, and the unity is developed into a Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost;" and " We never suffer ’Two Gods’ or ’Two Lords’ to pass our lips, though the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, and. Each is God." Many more might be given; but we may close with Origen, whose relation to the subsequent development of the doctrine is very important. His testimony also is worthy to close: " When I speak of the omnipotence of God, of His invisibility and eternity, my words are lofty; when I speak of the coeternity of His Only-begotten Son, and His other mysteries, my words are lofty; when I deal with the mightiness of the Holy Ghost, my words are lofty: as to these only it is allowed to use lofty words. After these Three, henceforth speak nothing loftily; for all things are mean and low, compared with the height of the Trinity. Let not then your high words be many, except concerning Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." It is clearly an error to date the unfolded dogma of the Trinity from the fourth century. It is found throughout the ante-Nicene age. But it cannot be denied that the germ, and gradual growth, of these tendencies towards error are soon apparent after the departure of the Apostles. All sprang from a vain attempt humanly to reconcile the Trinity with the essential unity of the Godhead; and what may be called MONARCHIANISM was the watchword of each.

SABELLIANISM. The first class rejected the distinction of Divine Hypostases or Persons. Their watchword was the eternal supremacy of the Monas, or the hidden God; it admitted, in the term Trias, that God was revealed in three prosopon, or faces or semblances, according to the dispensations of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit; As this doctrine was taught by Praxeas (160—180) and others, it was at once rejected as abolishing the distinction between the Father and the Son Who suffered; and they who held it were on that account named PATRIPASSIANS. But Sabellius of Ptolemais, A.D. 250, more fully developed the error, which from him has taken the name of SABELLIANISM; and from his peculiar theory, that of MODALISM or the manifestation of the Deity in three personal Modes. Its philosophical principle was Pantheistic; the same God who is the Father evolving Himself in the Son and Spirit. Modern speculations have constantly reproduced this conception. More popularly stated, the doctrine simply assumes that the One God appeared first as Jehovah, then more clearly to the creature as the Son, then more fully and spiritually as the Holy Ghost.

SUBORDINATIONISMAND THE PRINCIPATUS OF THE FATHER. The general idea of SUBORDINATIONISM, or the introduction of a gradation in the Three Persons, took various forms. Its beginnings were simply the result of indistinctness in phrase. So Justin writes of the Son as en deutera chora, and of the Spirit as en trith tazei.

It was aided by the gradual development of a Logos-doctrine, which distinguished between the Logos endiathetos, eternal but impersonal reason in God, and the Logos prophorikos, a personal existence begotten in the Divine essence as the Firstborn of Creation and its Archetype. Opposition to Sabellianism stimulated speculation of this kind to the utmost. Clement of Alexandria, and still more Origen, did much to displace from the controversy the theological term Logos, and to substitute that of the Son: a change which was pregnant with important consequences. Origen established the Eternal Sonship: est namque ita aeterna, ac sempiterna

generatio, sicut splendor generativa a luce, almost the very language of the Nicene Creed. It has been said that he laid too much stress upon the origination of the Hypostases in the Eternal will. But this is hardly consistent with his constant affirmation that "the Onlybegotten was ever coexisting with God," and his interpretation of the day in which the Son was begotten as the everpresent Now of eternity, and his protest against the Arian formula " Once the Son was not" by anticipation. His followers certainly perverted his words, and have done much to connect his name with that error. On the whole, both the ante-Nicene and post-Nicene teachers labored with all their skill to preserve the Monarchia, or Unity of the Divine essence, by representing the Father as the Fountain of the Deity and its representative: so interpreting the eternal Gift of life in Himself to the Son, and the Eternal Procession of the Spirit.

They laid great stress on the mystery of the derived but eternally derived Divinity of the Son and the Holy Ghost, as rendering easy the descent of thought to the subordination of Both Persons in redemption. But the term Subordination came into use at a later time, as also that of the Principatus of the Father. The latter is not quite unobjectionable: the former is obviously perilous, from the difficulty of admitting a subordination in any sense which does not include inferiority. But of this more hereafter when Arminianism is before us.

ARIANISM.

It was the doctrine of Arius that the Son was a pure creature, and Son only by adoption, the perfection and origin of creation; made out of nothing, produced before all worlds: the link or medium between God and the universe. This heresy was condemned by the first (Ecumenical Council at Nicaea, A.D, 325. But a modification known as Semi- Arianism arose and obtained prevalence as the result of a certain indefiniteness in the language of the Nicene Council. The orthodox watchword, omoonsios, OF THE SAME SUBSTANCE, was opposed, even by some of the orthodox, as tending to Sabellianism.

Changing it into omoiousios, OF LIKE SUBSTANCE, some attempted to effect a compromise; but in vain, as between consubstantiality with God and mere likeness to the Divine nature there is an immeasurable gulf. The undue subordination of the Spirit had not been taught by the earlier Fathers; though they were sometimes lax in the figures they used, following a certain freedom in the Scripture. It has been represented that they sometimes identified Him with the Son; but it must be remembered that Theophilus, who is charged with this, speaks of the Trias, preceding Tertullian’s Latinised Trnitas in the second century. Origen’s teaching had erred more against the Spirit than it had against the Son. Arius, of necessity, having reduced the Son to a Divine creature, taught that the Spirit was the first creation of that Firstborn creature; though he maintained that the Son and the Holy Ghost, both persons, were much more intimately near to God than to the created universe. Semi-Arianism, which had gone as far as it could in making the Son the unchangeable Image of the Father, was not quite so solicitous to maintain the dignity of the Spirit. Macedonius, one of that party, has connected his name with the sect called that of the Pneumatomachoi or Enemies of the Spirit, which, after much private controversy, was condemned at the second Ecumenical Council in Constantinople, A.D. 381. But this council, though it established or defended the Personality and Deity of the Holy Ghost, did not determine His specific relation to the Father and the Son. It was not until A.D.594. at a synod held in Toledo, that the term FILIOQUE was added to the Nicene Creed, defining that the Spirit proceeded from the Father AND THE SON

by an Eternal Spiration corresponding to the Eternal Generation. The assertion of this conjunction of the Son with the Father as the Eternal Origin of the Spirit was one main cause of the permanent rupture between the Western Church which held, and the Eastern Church which rejected, the Double Procession of the Third Person of the Trinity.

DECISIONS ANDCREEDS. The ecumenical definition of the doctrine, as against heresy, was the chief theological labor of the fourth century. The decisions expressed in the Creeds gave birth to a discussion that settled the leading theological terms which protect them.

THECOUNCILS. The Councils OF NICAEA, A.D. 325, and of CONSTANTINOPLE, A.D. 381—the first universal or ecumenical—vindicated for ever the doctrine of the Trinity: the former in relation to the Son, the latter in relation to the Holy Ghost. The former, the history of which should be carefully studied, was summoned mainly for the condemnation of Arius, who maintained that the Son, " before He was begotten or created, had no being; that He was brought into existence by the will of God before the world: hon pote ote ouk hn ez ouk onton estin, there was a time when He was not, and He was produced from nothing; being not of the same substance with the Father, but as a creature mutable," and of course therefore liable to fall. The answer of the Synod determined that the Son was ek ths ousias tou patros, gennhtheis ou poihtheis, omoousios yo patri. This last term, the Homousion, became the watchword of orthodoxy: the Son was of the same essence or substance with the Father. After the honor of the Second Person was vindicated, occasion soon arose for the like vindication of the Holy Ghost, The teaching of Macedonius was to the Third Person what that of Arius was to the Second. He called Him diakonos KAI UPHRETHS, but not in the sense of the New Testament. The second or Constantinopolitan Council asserted that He was " the Lord, the zoopoion, or Lifegiver, worshipped and glorified, with the Father and the Son." His ekporeusis, or Procession, was from the Father; but, as we have seen, two centuries later FILIOQUE, from the Son, was added. THE THREE CREEDS. The THREE CREEDS may be regarded as the final and permanent expression of these ecumenical decisions.

1. The NICENE, or, as enlarged at Constantinople, the NICAENO-CONSTANTINOPOLITAN symbol, is the chief of these, as having a more definite theological character than the Apostles', and, unlike the Athanasian, being accepted by universal Christendom, the Greek Church excepting only one clause. It defines, as including the Toledan Filioque, the eternal generation of the Son, GOD OF GOD, and the eternal Procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son: thus establishing the true doctrine of Sub-ordination against Tritheism and Arianism. It declares the equal worship due to the Three: thus establishing the true doctrine of the Unity against Sabellianism.

2. The APOSTLES' CREED, or Symbolum Apostolicum, was not finished in its present form until after the Nicene; but, so far as concerns the doctrine of the Three Persons, was the earliest, being simply an expansion of the Baptismal Formula. The assertion of the Triune Name is limited to its historical revelation in the creating and the redeeming work. The dogmatic definition of the Trinity, whether absolute or economical, is absent.

3. The ATHANASIAN CREED, or Symbolum Quicunque; from its first word, was never ecumenically adopted, being a private document of unknown origin: probably of the sixth century, and of the school of Augustine. It contains the most elaborate statement of the dogmatic relations of the One Divine Nature and the Three Persons of the Triad, as well as of the Two Natures and

the One Person in Christ, that is to be found, and is an exquisite study of orthodox logical distinctions. But its damnatory clauses are alien to the spirit of a profession of faith; and, moreover, its doctrine of the Trinity, like that of the other two, does not give due prominence to its redemptional aspect.

TERMINOLOGY.

There can be no doubt that the Holy Spirit watched over these decisions; but it would be presumptuous to assert the same special Providence for the endless dogmatic controversies that followed. It is impossible to summarize the history, but the result may be given in the conventional application of a certain Vocabulary which has had a fixed place in subsequent theology.

1. The terms Ousia in the Greek, and Essentia or Substantia in the Latin, with Theotos, were reserved for the essential Godhead, or what may be called the Nature of Deity. The terms upostasis, idiotos, and prosopon, were limited to the distinction of the Persons: the first, which really means substantial reality, was adopted in preference to the last, which, as meaning a form or presentation, might bear a Sabellian construction. Persona in the Latin, was exposed to the same objection; but it has triumphed, and has ever since shared with the Latinised term Hypostasis the function of expressing the reality of the Godhead of each Suppositum Intelligens, or self conscious Agent, in the Holy Trinity. While the Modalist or Sabellian danger was thus avoided—allos kai allos, not allo kai allo, —the Fathers of that age, of whom Athanasius was the leader in the East, and afterwards Augustine in the West, did not teach that the Three Persons represented a common nature as three men represent the common humanity. They held that the unity was numerical; and that, in a sense unsearchable, the entire Godhead is in each Person. To express this, they used the word perixorhsis, which is sufficiently explained by the Latin equivalents, Interactio, or Interexistentia, or Intercommunio.

2. The question of Subordination was at the heart of every discussion; but neither Greek nor Latin gave a watchword for this. The same divines, however, who laid stress on the numerical unity of the Divine essence, zealously maintained the eternal derivation of the Son, quoad Son, from the Father: thus teaching a subordination of relation, without involving inferiority of essence. The following words of Augustine express the thought of antiquity on this subject, which, nevertheless, as he admits, passeth knowledge: "Pater quod est a nullo est: quod autem Pater est, propter Filium est. Filius vero et quod Filius est, propter Patrem est; et quod est, a Patre est." But another sentence, following hard on the former, shows the poverty of all thinking on this dread mystery: "Filius non tantum ut sit Filius, quod relative dicitur, sed omnino ut sit, ipsam substantiam nascendo habet." In one sentence the Person only of the Son is of the Father; in the other the essence, as well as the Filial Property, is begotten. The latter seems to have been the general strain of antiquity in its method of treating this inscrutable question.

MEDIAEVAL. The Mediaeval Schoolmen exhausted their subtlety on this profound subject; but added nothing of permanent value.

1. Their speculations tended to Tritheism or Sabellianism in the measure of their leaning towards NOMINALISM or REALISM respectively. The Nominalist philosophy, which allowed nothing but nominal existence to the essence or general nature represented by the individual as a specimen, obviously though unintentionally led to Tritheism. The Realist philosophy, which asserted the

reality of the nature behind the individual, was more faithful to the Trinity in Unity. The controversy between Roscellinus the Nominalist, and Anselm the Realist, was an important chapter in the history of an endless controversy, which spread into a number of side-issues, embracing almost every point that has over been raised. It will be at once perceived that the opposite extremes would naturally suggest to some minds a compromise: the realist Essence and the nominalist Three Persons, each both essence and individual, would naturally lead to TETRATHEISM, Damian of Alexandria, and some others, fell into the snare of a fourfold Divinity. But the general soundness of the Schoolmen may be gathered from the terminology they established in their analysis: they introduced into the expression of the dogma those distinctions of paternity, filiation, community of nature, and relations, and properties which we shall find reasserted in a better form by the Reformation divines.

2. Both the mysticism and the dialectics of the Middle Ages freely explored the analogies by which the mystery of the doctrine might be reconciled with human reason. This style of argument or meditation they inherited from the early Fathers, and transmitted to modern philosophy after exhausting it themselves. Analogies were derived from many regions. The light, radiance, and heat of the sun, which is neither of the three alone, but one in their trinity; the fountain, flux, and stream; the root, the stem, the flower; the intellect, will, and feeling of human nature, as also its body, soul, spirit; thesis, analysis, synthesis in the order of the one thought, or the subject, object, and identity of the two: — all these were then brought into the service of an un-conscious Rationalism and are in its service still.

3. The last of these trios suggests the modern semi-philosophical, semi-Christian, views of the Trinity, which have lately carried the circle of human thinking back to the speculations of the earliest Pantheism. The so-called Science of Religion shows and proves that most if not all of the Theistic conceptions of antiquity took the form of a Pantheistic Triad; feeling after if haply they might find the Trinity, and so paying an important though unintentional tribute to eternal truth. Thus the Hondo Brahm was the essential Being; Vishnu, as revealed in the universe; Siva, as returning into being again.

Buddhism wanders from this in the direction of the Persian Dualism. Greek philosophy, as represented by Plato, was cast in the same mould; so much so that the Christian doctrine has been represented as a Neo-Platonist importation into Christianity of Plato’s three Principia, derived from Parmenides: the first, to on, the Cause of all things; the second, the Logos, the Reason and Ruler of all things produced into existence; the third, the psuche kosmos, or the soul of the world. Nothing can be more certain than that the Trinity of personal hypostases glimmered in the writings of Plato; and that his speculations exerted much influence upon ante-Nicene Christian thought and language, as they were interpreted by the aid of Philo, and formed into a system by Ammonius Saccas. But it requires only a very slight comparison to show that the doctrine of the Trinity which the New Testament most clearly contains is in its very fundamental principles a new revelation, and not merely an ancient speculation disencumbered of some of its tributaries. Modern Pantheism has reproduced the old thoughts in a new phraseology which is as baffling to the under-standing as it is opposed to Scripture. It is impossible to put into other words than their own their speculations. . But they are all variations on the notion of Hegel that the Trinity is the formal expression of the movement of the Absolute Spirit, Who becomes another in the universe and as Spirit knows Himself and returns into His own being. Whatever change modern Pantheism has

introduced into the older system of thought is altogether in favor of the Christian doctrine, though the Christian doctrine must utterly disavow its method of presenting it.

THEREFORMATION. The communities of the Reformation retained the Three Creeds of antiquity, and were generally faithful to the doctrine of the Trinity, as in its absolute so also and especially in its Redemption or Evangelical aspect.

1. The Lutheran and Reformed formularies contain nothing entirely new, but their dogmatic standards in particular abound in careful analysis, the sum of which is as follows. One Divine Essence subsists in Three Persons: the unity is numerical, the plurality is hypostatical. The distinction is connected and harmonized with the unity by the term Perixorosis (Circulation or Inter-action), which signifies generally that in the Eternal Trinity the whole Godhead must be regarded as in each Person, whether it respects nature or operation. The hypostatic character of each Person may be referred to the essence or the relation to each other. The internal properties of the Persons are five: to the Father belong the words unbegotten (agennosia) and paternity, to the Father and the Son, spiration; to the Son, filiation; to the Spirit, procession. The internal Acts are two: generation and spiration. These are distinctive; but the external acts are three, creation, redemption, sanctification, and these are common to the Three Persons. All the elements of the dogmatic study of the doctrine are here: the legitimate extension of the Athanasian Creed. But there is this difference in favor of the dogmatics of the Reformation: their exhibition of the Absolute Trinity has always interwoven with it an Evangelical reference to the Redemptional aspect of the doctrine.

2. After the Reformation most of the ancient types of error reappeared in various forms adapted to altered circumstances. Christian theology, which then took a new departure, had to pursue its way through the same course of controversy. But it may be said that the doctrine of the Trinity was now not so much directly opposed as indirectly. It was not at first the object of curious speculation in itself. Its enemies were now more pronounced; and, departing from the truth in every form, appeared as Socinian Unitarians: denying the Divinity of Christ with the Personality of the Holy Ghost, and thus reviving a form of error which had long been unknown. The theological ground shifts to that of the Person of Christ. But, in process of time; the ancient Sabellianism returned in a tone of speculation and phraseology which has infected many communities, but never formed a distinct community for itself. Modern Sabellianism assumed its philosophical and mystical character in Schleiermacher’s theology; its almost equally influential and scarcely less mystical expression in Swedenborgianism.

(1.) The fundamental principle of the philosophy of Emmanuel Swedenborg was the unity of all things in the duality of physical and spiritual existence: these two being, as it were, conjugates or counterparts, in perfect correspondence with each other and eternally related. Pantheism reduced all to the unity of matter and spirit; but Swedenborg, who was no Pantheist, simply made the phenomenal universe the visible expression of spiritual realities, man being in communion with the other world, or capable of communion with it, through a certain spiritual body belonging to his nature which religion reveals to him though religion does not create it. The theology based on this principle, which Swedenborg professed to receive as a new revelation, affects every point of Christian doctrine, and of course that of the Trinity. The Supreme Being also has form as well as spirit, and His form is that which we know in ourselves as human. In Him is a trinity of principles,

but not of personal subsistences. As the twofold body of man is one body with a spirit energizing outwardly, so the distinction popularly called that of Father and Son is only the distinction of the Eternal God-man and the Same taking a human body in the Virgin to make it operative through the Holy Ghost. "Before the creation of the world this Trinity did not exist, but it was provided and made since the creation, when God became incarnate, and then centered in the Lord God." In Jesus this outward body was, unlike ours, glorified into an infinite spirituality. Swedenborg's speculations, the most remarkable of modern times, are, as touching our present doctrine, Sabellian. And every argument against that ancient system of thought is valid against this modern representative of it.

(2.) The system of Schleiermacher is more Pantheistic than this, but it is a Sabellianised Pantheism. Like Swedenborg, though on different principles, he held Christ to be the only God: the Father in Himself or in the universe is the Son in Jesus, the Ideal or Pattern man, and the Spirit is the same God in Nature and in the Church. The introduction of the Divine life into humanity in or through Christ makes God man and man God. There is no preexistence of the Son or of the Holy Ghost. Translating all this into the language of philosophy, Deity as the Absolute Being is the Father, He comes to consciousness of Himself in the Son, and returns to Himself in the Spirit. In its simplest form this runs back into the speculations of the Schoolmen and indeed of most deep thinkers from the beginning: from Augustine and Anselm to Melanchthon, Leibnitz and Martensen. On the ground that man is created in the image of God this style of thought conceives of the Supreme according to the analogy of human nature, God cannot, any more than man, be eternally self-conscious without being objective to Himself and 'knowing the identity. In man the objective Ego is ideal, and the same person as the subjective. But in the infinity of the Divine Essence this analogy fails: He must as Trinity be Three Persons. But it is plain that whatever service the analogy renders—and it has satisfied or seemed to satisfy some of the profoundest intellects—it leads to a Sabellian conception.

(3.) It enters here only because the early Arian and Semi-Arian teachers laid so much stress on the Theiotos or Divinity of the two subordinate Beings. They were regarded as the bond, or rather the intermediary links, between the Absolute and the conditioned, the Infinite and the finite: looking toward the creature they were firstborn or rather first created before the worlds; but looking Godward they were more directly emanations of the Monad than the creature. The doctrine was a speculative substitution for the Gnostic errors of aeonic emanation. It was and is wherever held a refuge in which philosophical thought, always striving to reach unity, concinnity, and the solution of mystery, dreams of explaining a God with triple gradation linking continuously the Finite and the infinite, the Absolute and the conditioned.

3. The early Arianism also has been sporadic. It has molded opinion very extensively in later Christendom: never shaping a formulary or founding a sect, but; influencing the thoughts of many thinkers and coloring the sentiments of poetry, and infusing itself into the devotions of many who are almost unconscious of their error. The history of Arian tendency in England is an important and instructive one: it brings in some great names in our philosophical and theological literature; but it shows that the healthy common sense of readers of the Scripture has never and never will accept this compromise. Either the New Testament must be rejected as a final authority and the Deistic Rationalism of Unitarianism accepted, or, the Scriptures being received as the Rule of Faith, the FULNESS OF THE GODHEAD must be adored in the incarnate Song of Solomon 1:1-17 This

subject also belongs rather to Christology or the Person of Christ.

1 Colossians 2:9.

4. Subordinationism was exaggerated by the Remonstrant divines, especially those of the later age of Arminianism. The difference between the true doctrine on this subject, as already exhibited, and the error into which it easily declines, may be marked in the following words of Episcopius: "Patri soli proprie divinitatis perfectionem seu akmon competere, quod eam a se ipso, hoc est, a nullo alio habeat. Unde consequitur, Patrem sic esse primum ut etiam summus sit, TUM ORDINE, TUM DIGNITATE, TUM POTESTATE." And, with less offence, in those of Limborch "Dignius siquidem est generare quam generari, spirare quam spirari." It is well known that the tone of Arminian thought on this incomprehensible subject glided downwards by sure though imperceptible degrees towards Unitarianism.

PRACTICAL CONCLUSION. A close study of the variations in opinion on this topic, following the bare outlines thus given, will lead to some important practical conclusions.

1. The doctrine of the ever-blessed Trinity is essential to Christianity: there is no Theology, there is no Christology without it. That the one Divine essence exists in three eternal, coequal, personal subsistences is the foundation of the Christian Faith. This has been the catholic belief, as the catholic interpretation of Scripture. Whatever exception may be taken to dogmatic definitions, the eternal underlying truth is the life of the Christian revelation. What will be hereafter exhibited as the Mediatorial Trinity is only the mystery of the Absolute Trinity as revealed in the salvation of man.

2. Again, it cannot be denied that the best and purest teaching on this subject has laid emphasis on the mystery of an eternal subordination, in the Scriptural sense of the term, in the interior relations of the Two Persons of the Trinity to the First, The simple statement of the Nicene Creed which asserts ONE GOD at the outset, and that the Eternal Son is GOD OF GOD, expresses the faith of the Church. But it is difficult to draw the line, either in thought or by word, between truth and error here. Our Lord gives us a revelation in words which suggests its defense, though they cannot reveal to the human intellect the full conception of the truth. As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to THE SON to have life in Himself. 1 These words refer to the Eternal Son. His authority in time and human things follows with a change in the expression: and hath given Him authority to execute judgment also, because He is THE SON OF MAN. And these together constitute the ground of an equal Divine reverence: That all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. He that honored not the Son honored not the Father which hath sent Him. 2 This subject, however, must be remitted to the doctrine of the Person of Christ, where it will be seen that the Eternal Generation of the Second Person is the sacred though most incomprehensible link connecting Him with the Incarnation and our new sonship derived from that. We may object to the language of earlier theology which ventured to speak of the Father as the Autotheos, the Fons, Origo, and Principium of the Divinity; as well as to that interpretation of My Father is greater than I, 3 assigning an inferiority to the Eternal Son, which Hilary thus expresses: " Et quis non Patrem potiorem confitebitur, ut ingenitum a genito, ut patrem a filio, ut eum qui miserit ab eo qui missus est, ut volentem ab ipso qui obediat? Et ipse nobis erit testis: Pater major me est. Haec ita ut sunt, intelligenda sunt, sed cavendum est, ne apud imperitos gloriam Filii honor Patris infirmet." This last clause is the sheet-anchor of our security. And, always remembering this, we may give the ETERNAL SONSHIP and the ETERNAL PROCESSION their place in our silent

thought as an infinite solution of what is still an infinite mystery, and accept the words of Bishop Pearson: " It is no diminution to the Son, to say He is from Another, for His very name imports as much; but it were a diminution to the Father to speak so of Him; and there must be some preeminence, where there is no place for derogation. What the Father is He is from None; what the Son is, He is from Him; what the first is He giveth; what the second is, He receiveth. The first is Father indeed by reason of His Son, but He is not God by reason of Him; whereas the Son is not so only in regard of the Father, but also God by reason of the same."

1 John 5:26-27 : 2 John 5:23; 3 John 14:28.

3. While it is obvious, on the one hand, that no human language can utter this mystery, Theology, both scientific and practical, demands that the Trinitarian phraseology should be ordered with careful precision as at least guarding the truth against the approach of error. After all that may be said as to the inadequacy of human words, and the absence of definitions from Scripture, it still remains true that many others besides those of the New Testament must be used both in teaching and in worship. AS it regards the scientific terminology of the doctrine it is well to be familiar with the terms that express the relations of the One to the Three-in-One. No thoughtful student will either discard or undervalue them. The Deity is the Divine

ESSENCE or SUBSTANCE or NATURE; the Three are SUBSISTENCES, HYPOSTASES, and PERSONS: the, last words of these counterpart series are philosophically the least exact, but they are the conventional and sacred language of the teaching, preaching, and worshipping Church. So also with regard to our practical and ordinary language. Nowhere is precision more necessary than in the ordering of the phraseology of worship. The mind and the tongue must be so educated as to recoil from such language as is tinctured with either the Tritheistic, or the Sabellian, or the Arian error. One of the results of careful and reverent study will be the discipline that shall make every word faithful to the equal honor of each of the Three Adorable Persons in the unity of the Other Two, and in the unity of the Godhead: adoring and praying to each with this sacred reservation. But, after all, we must remember what the ancient Church was never weary of enforcing in relation to this subject: the Nature of God is arrhtos, INEFFABILIS unsearchable and unspeakable; the Godhead can be known only by him who is hodidaktos, taught of God: and that knowledge itself is and will eternally be only ek merouss, IN PART.

Chapter 8

10. Vol 01 - The Attributes of God

The Attributes of God THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD RELATION TO DIVINE ESSENCE

CLASSIFICATIONS ATTRIBUTES OF ABSOLUTE ESSENCE

Spirituality;

Infinity;

Immensity;

Eternity;

Self - Sufficiency;

Immutability;

Perfection;

Observations ATTRIBUTES RELATED TO THE CREATURE:

Freedom;

Omnipotence;

Omnipresence;

Omniscience;

Wisdom;

Goodness;

Observations ATTRIBUTES RELATED TO MORAL GOVERNMENT Moral Attributes Generally;

Holiness and Love;

Holiness;

Righteousness;

Justice;

Truth;

Faithfulness;

Love;

Mercy and Grace;

General Observations on the Study of the Attributes By the Divine Attributes are to be understood the full assemblage of those Perfections which God ascribes to Himself in His Word: partly as the fuller expansion of His Names, and partly as designed to regulate our conception of His character. They are to be distinguished from the Properties of the Triune Essence, on the one hand; and, on the other, from the Acts by which His relations to His creatures are made known. Hence dogmatic Theology regards them, first in their unity as Perfections manifesting the Divine Nature, and, secondly, in their variety as Attributes capable of systematic arrangement.

RELATION TO THE DIVINE ESSENCE. As related to the essence of God, their unity in variety is only the full revelation of the Divine nature in itself; their variety in unity is the real, authoritative, and adequate revelation of it to man. They are one in God, yet many to us.

1. No being or essence is conceivable apart from its attributes and qualities. It is a primary law of thought that all phenomena whether of mind or matter are manifestations of some underlying substance thus only known to us. What is true of all other objects of our knowledge is true also of the Highest. Save in His qualities and attributes God is not revealed to His creatures. The Eternal unclothed in these is not a definite object of thought at all; that pure unmodified being which Pantheistic mysticism presented as its highest conception of God is reduced to nothing. Such super essential existence has no place either in Scripture or in human reason. On the other hand, the entire Divine essence is made known in the assemblage of His qualities predicated of it. The Bible never distinguishes between the Being of God and the NAME or Names that reveal His being. Its nearest approach to a distinction is in the constant use of the term GLORY, which is the effulgence of the manifestation of the hidden essence; and therefore by no means a synonym of the Divine attributes, as is sometimes said. The Divine attributes may exist without their glory: a truth which lies at the basis of the condescension and humiliation of the Incarnate Son. Theology adopts the word Perfections, as they are attributed by God to Himself; Attributes, as His creatures, Divinely instructed, assign them to Him. Moreover, these attributes belong to ALL THAT is CALLED GOD: 1 that is, to the Triune Essence, and each of the Persons of the Godhead. Hence it is well that the doctrine of the Holy Trinity should have preceded the present subject. But, as referred to the Trinity, the attributes must not be confounded with the Divine PROPERTIES, which is one of the terms used to express the characteristics of the interior relation of the Godhead, the Three Divine Hypostases, Subsistences, or Persons.

1 2 Thessalonians 2:4.

2. The variety of the attributes corresponds to a reality in the Eternal. Who reveals Himself as He is neither leaving His character to the conjectures of His creatures, nor putting into their minds notions of that character which are fictitious and unreal. To make the several qualities of the Divine nature depend only on our conceptions of them is to lose the Divine nature altogether: it is to substitute for the only true God an imaginary Being incapable of definition. The interminable discussions of the Schoolmen on this subject, which have been continued in later times and revived of late with special reference to the knowable-ness of God, are not without a profound interest. The Nominalists, who regarded general terms as merely names of abstractions formed in our minds, effaced the real distinction in the Divine attributes: to them God was in the simplicity of His essence ACTUS PURUS, thought and act, or act and power, being one in Him, and the perfections of the Divine nature existing only in our thoughts, in which we assign to God something

that is the cause of what we find in ourselves. The Realists, on the other hand, who regarded general terms as representing real objective existences, clung to the reality in God both of the Triune Persons and of the various perfections He assumes. In every age those who hold with them think of God as essential personality, as really invested with His attributes in perfection as His creatures are invested with them imperfectly. But here our safeguard is to remember that in the simplicity of the eternal essence there can be nothing composite: the whole essence is in each attribute: God is All in all, All in each. Accordingly it follows that we can think of no such accidental attribute as may be and is in everything that is not God; as man, for instance, may or may not have wisdom.

There is no perfection in the Supreme that is not of His essence. Thus, while we reject what may be called the Sabellian theology of the Divine attributes—each is distinct in the unity of the supreme nature—in the Glory of God all the several components of His nature blend into one.

3. Hence it may be said that only through the way of the Divine attributes can we reach a definition of the Divine nature. There is a sense indeed in which the being of God is absolutely undefinable, because absolutely incomprehensible. But, as to define is rather to separate or distinguish from everything else than to explain what is thus defined or marked off, there is nothing more amenable to definition than the nature of God. Of course, to think of genus and species is here out of the question. But we may speak of God as a subject with all good predicates, and with these in their infinite perfection: of no other object of knowledge can we speak with equal confidence. In His essence He is the Being of beings: the Source, Sustainer, and End of all things that are. But this already expresses His difference from all that is not Himself. To express that difference fully is to enumerate the perfections of His nature. We cannot sanctify Him in our hearts from every other object without thinking of or naming His attributes. The moment definition begins these are absolutely necessary. Indeed, we have no notion of Deity which does not connote some idea which severs the conception from all other conceptions. Every thought of God involves the thought of His attributes: without these He is verily and indeed an unknown and an unknowable God.

CLASSIFICATION. In systematic theology the attributes require classification. Our best guide, the Scripture, gives hints and specimens of an arrangement of its abundant materials; and such an arrangement tends, as will be seen, to elucidate their connection with the various branches of the system of revelation. To exhibit them merely in an orderly series involves too great a sacrifice to simplicity. But it is as difficult as it is important to determine the guiding principles of such a classification.

1. The favorite method has been to make a division into two counterpart classes. Hence they are distributed as natural and moral by a distinction which the meaning of neither of these words will allow: both are inappropriate to the Deity, and the harshness is not removed if metaphysical and ethical are substituted. The instinctive objection we feel to these terms is not felt to the correlatives of absolute and relative, immanent and transitive, internal and external: these distinctions furnish the right clue and are sound so far as they go; but they do not suggest those special manifestations of God which give their peculiar glory to Christian theology. It is dangerous to speak of positive and negative attributes; for while there is no positive excellence in Deity which does not imply negation or its opposite, the negative ideas of infinity and so forth are really and truly positive. Lastly, when they are classed as communicable and incommunicable, it must be

remembered that, as attributes, all are alike incommunicable to the creature.

2. Secondly, the names and perfections of God have been ordered with reference to the method by which we attain, or may be supposed to attain, our conceptions of them. The Mediaeval doctors taught that we arrive at adequate notions of the Divine perfections, first, "via negationis:" by the instinctive denial of limitation and defect to the Supreme; secondly, " via eminentiae:" by ascribing to Him the most eminent possession of what in us or in our idea is good; thirdly, " via causalitatis," by making Him the actual, virtual, or permissive cause of every effect observable in the economy of things. This scholastic method has always commended itself by its simplicity, though it is liable to some of the objections that render the former method doubtful: especially it fails in its application to the attributes which are concerned with human redemption.

3. Thirdly, it has been sought to make our own nature the basis of the distribution of His attributes in Whose image we were created: " Qualis homo, talis Deus." Man is conscious of his own substantial being and identity through all changes: this suggests that God exists, apart from all phenomena. But man is conscious of three orders of selfmanifestation or modes of consciousness: the three constituents of his existence are intellect, sensibility, will. Hence a threefold classification of the Divine attributes, so far as they are distinguished from His eternal essence. In modern times, and especially by the followers of Schleiermacher, the demands of man’s religious need have been the regulator: a sense of dependence implying the absolute attributes, a sense of sin the moral perfections, and the whole being consummated by the revelation of love in Christ. Here, then, is undoubtedly a ground of truth. Every rational human thought of God springs from man’s knowledge of himself. This is the grand prerogative of human nature that it is a reflection of the Divine. We either ascribe to our Maker the perfection of what is imperfect in ourselves, or we deny to Him what in ourselves we count evil. But it is obvious that there are relations of the Infinite to the finite, of the Creator to the creature, and of the Holy God to sinners, which forbid the carrying out of this principle of classification. It is enough to say concerning these methods that they have too much tendency to make man the measure of the Deity.

4. Guided by these principles of analysis, though not bound to any of them, we shall, first, consider the attributes pertaining to God as an absolute or unrelated Being; then, those arising out of the relation between the Supreme and the creature, which indeed require the creature for their manifestation; and, finally, those which belong to the relation between God and moral beings under His government, with special reference to man. The justification of this arrangement will appear in due course.

ATTRIBUTES OF THE ABSOLUTE ESSENCE. The Divine essence, or the Absolute, regarded in itself and in itself alone, is to be conceived as pure spirit, unlimited by time or space, independent of all other existence, in its perfect self knowing no change or process of development. As these are the attributes of a personal Being they may be summed up as Spirituality, Infinity, Eternity, Immensity, necessary Self-sufficiency, Unchangeableness, and Perfection. These great words, carefully examined, are or suggest all the attributes of God which are immanent, independent of the creature, and essential to a right conception of His nature.

THESPIRITUALITYOF GOD.

Spirituality is the attribute which most nearly and fully expresses the very essence of God as the one eternal substance in which all other attributes inhere. Hence the Scripture does not tell us that the Divine nature is spiritual; but our Lord, the only Revealer, declares that Pneuma ho Theos, GOD is SPIRIT: 1 the only definition He ever gave. This may be understood in two ways: first, positively, as the perfection of all that we know of spirit in our own consciousness; and. negatively, as excluding all that is inconsistent with our conception of pure spirit

1 John 4:24.

1. The human spirit was created in the image of God. By the testimony of our consciousness the Father of spirits 1 is a real, substantial Person, Whose personal selfconsciousness is that of a thinking or intelligent self determining Agent. The Scripturesabound with testimonies, pervading their whole structure, that He holds intercourse with man as a Spirit with spirit. This is and ought to be accepted as the foundation of all religion.

1 Hebrews 12:9.

2. This attribute is not generally asserted of God in an abstract manner, or as defining His nature. It is appealed to for two-purposes: to guard our conceptions of the Object of our worship from everything that would debase it; and, to impress upon us a sense of the dignity of our origin and the grandeur of our vocation as worshippers of the One, Triune, Eternal Spirit.

(1.) Of what pure spirit is we can form no notion. The word gives little help, as it simply expresses the breathing forth which in its influence is pneuma: an invisible energy, known by its effects. All pure being, especially spiritual being, as underlying its phenomena, is beyond our grasp. But, in thinking of the highest Spirit, we put away every idea of the limitations which belong to our own spirit. The attribute gives us the simplicity and unity of the Divine uncompounded nature; its immateriality, immortality, and invisibility. Therefore the term is, after all, the predicate of a personal God, distinct from the material and created universe. Pantheism has always seemed in words to deny this: seldom in reality. Some of the greatest leaders of Pantheistic thought have been better than their creed: filled with the idea of a universal directing Spirit, but forgetting that He is and can be in His own nature only Spirit.

(2.) Of that God in His Triune essence, and of each Person in the unity of the Godhead, as the object of worship, spirituality is predicated. This attribute belongs to the absolute Godhead as before all creaturely existence. But it is brought into relation with the economy of redemption. Of the Father, and also the Son, it is said, Whom no man hath seen nor can see! As before: Unto the King eternal (of the worlds and dispensations, ton aionon), immortal, invisible! 1 The Son is the Spirit. 2 The Holy Ghost, holy in His function and relation to redemption, is by His very name to Pneuma. 3 Hence the worship of God must be spiritual: not indeed as formless and void and without material aids, but as the homage of spirit to Spirit: 4 They that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth. 5 The Apostle Paul teaches the Gentiles, through their own teachers, that we are also his offspring; 6 and the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of that God as the Father of spirits. 7 In the former passage the inference is a remarkable one: from the spiritual essence in man to the spirituality of God and of His perfect service. In the latter, which echoes the words of the Old Testament, The God of the spirits of all flesh, 8 the duty of subjection and; the privilege of LIFE in the fullest sense are connected with it God only hath immortality—that is, the essential

incorruptibility of Spirit—and of His incorruptible immortality the indivisibility and indestructibility of the human spirit is an image and a gift.9

1 1 Timothy 1:17; 2 2 Corinthians 3:17; 3 John 4:24; 4 Deuteronomy 4:15-19; 5 John 4:24; 6 Acts 17:28; 7 Hebrews 12:9; 8 Numbers 16:22; Numbers 27:16; 9 1 Timothy 6:16.

THEINFINITYOF GOD.

There is no idea concerning God more necessary to the human mind than that He is Infinite in His being and perfections and all that is His: that whatever is to be predicated of Him is to be infinitely predicated, or without limitation. But while this is an indispensable requisite of every thought concerning the Supreme, it is, at the same time, an idea that must for ever overwhelm the finite mind which must nevertheless entertain it.

1. The notion of the Infinite belongs only to God, to Whom alone of all objects of thought it is, strictly speaking, applicable. No other subject of this predicate has or can have a real existence. There is no meaning in the terms " infinite space " and " infinite duration:" space is nothing save as occupied, but what occupies it must be limited; and duration implies some limited thing that endures. It is only when it is made the attribute of a Being, and one Being, that the word has, strictly speaking, any meaning.

2. Infinity is a positive notion in a negative form: that it is a mere negation of limits springs from the finite nature of our own understanding; that it is a positive judgment or affirmation of our minds, and in our own in destructible conviction something more than mere negation, is a tribute to the essential nobleness of the human intellect. When we say that we ourselves are finite we mean more than a mere denial of our infinity: we express a real judgment concerning our own and every creaturely existence to which the standard of infinity is applied. So when we say that God is infinite we express the sacred thought that He is beyond the circumscription and the comprehension of our understanding.

3. It is important to remember that the word infinite is one of our own making, and not employed in Scripture. It must be narrowly watched and guarded in its application to the Supreme. It belongs to Him not as abstract essence but as a Personal Spirit. Nothing but confusion can arise from applying it to the nature of God as if that were capable of diffusion and its expansion regarded as going on to infinity. The human mind is not capable of thinking save under the conditions of time and space. The Infinite is revealed to faith as above the condition of time, and of this Eternity is the expression; as above the conditions of space, and of this Immensity is the expression. Infinity in philosophical precision has nothing to do with God’s relation to the economy of created things; nor is it right to ask how anything can exist which is not God if God be infinite. This term belongs rather to His attributes than to Himself. An infinite Spirit is infinite in the attributes of spirit: in knowledge, in power, and in what we call in human language resources. If it is urged that an unlimited Being must include all being, the only answer— besides the unfailing acknowledgment of our utter incapacity to argue on such subjects—is that an infinite Spirit must by the very term be able to create finite existences. His power is unlimited.

THEIMMENSITYOF GOD.

1. The Immensity of God is only once declared in Scripture; but when it is said that Behold, heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain Thee, 1 a formula is used which expresses the universal sentiment of revelation and precisely defines the supremacy of the Eternal Spirit over all conditions of space. It is not that He fills immensity with His presence: He is the only Immensity, all things created being measurable and limited. The universe CANNOT CONTAIN Him: not because His essence stretches beyond the confines of created things, but because His eternal Spirit transcends and is inconsistent with all notions of space. Space is born out of His immensity, as time out of His eternity: but none can declare the generation of either. This incomprehensible attribute of the pure and absolute Divine essence is the ground of His omnipresence, hereafter to be considered: because, while above and independent of all space, He can, when space and all that it inherit come into existence at His fiat, fill all with His presence. It can hardly be said that the Immensity of God is the negative of which His ubiquity is the positive. Both are positive conceptions; strictly related to each other and yet very different. The former lifts our thought to the overwhelming contemplation of a Being above all created existence; the latter teaches us to draw the necessary inference that the Creator of all things is present to every creature, or, putting this in a better form, that every creature throughout space is present to Him.

1 2 Chronicles 6:18.

2. This eternal attribute is in Scripture appealed to for two purposes: first, to bring near the thought of the Divine omnipresence; secondly, and chiefly, to guard us against unduly localizing our conception of the Object of worship. In Him we live and move and have our being:

1 as our time is enfolded by the Divine eternity, so our place is in the bosom of the Divine immensity. Am I a God at hand, saith the Lord, and not a God afar off? Can any hide himself in secret places, that I shall not see him? saith the Lord. Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord. 2 The response is that of holy fear: Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit, and whither shall I flee from Thy presence? 3 and of holy confidence: Because He is at my right hand, I shall not be moved. 4 But when the Temple was dedicated, in which Jehovah would dwell with His people, the Holy Ghost inspired Solomon’s sublime appeal already quoted: But who is able to build Him a house, seeing the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain Him? 5 It is not enough for us in our worship to remember that our God is everywhere present, that He is oar Father in heaven; we must remember also that He is beyond and above even the heavens: Thus saith the Lord, The heaven is My throne, and the earth is My footstool. 6 It is a high flight to the thought of a Being Who is everywhere present; it is a still higher thought that we are in the presence of One Who is above all space and time.

1 Acts 17:28; 2 Jeremiah 23:23-24; 3 Psalms 139:7; 4 Psalms 16:8; 5 2 Chronicles 2:6; 6 Isaiah 66:1.

THEETERNITYOF GOD.

1. What the Divine immensity is to space the Divine eternity is to time. That God is eternal is the constant declaration of Scripture: in fact this is a predicate more habitual than any other, being the first revelation of Himself to His people, I AM THAT I Amos 1:1-15 and continued in a variety of other forms down to the end, when it returns to the first, Which is, and Which was, and Which is to come, the Almighty. 2 It must be remembered, however, that very few of the passages which

introduce the word assign the absolute attribute we are now considering to God. The Name that declares His essential, necessary, underived being sufficiently sustains the doctrine of the Divine eternity. In one memorable passage it is said that Abraham called there on the name of Jehovah, the Everlasting God, or THE GOD OF ETERNITY, Yahweh 'Eel `Owlaam, 3 which once more occurs in the prophet: Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Lord—owlaam Yahweh Bowree', the God of eternity, Jehovah—the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? 4 Undoubtedly in these, and some other passages, the word eternal has its profound meaning of time HIDDEN in the abyss of eternity. But it will be found that all the terms generally used carry with them the notion of successive duration indefinitely extended, and therefore fall short of the pure conception of eternal. Hence they are explained with that meaning by many paraphrases: such as, Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God, 5 where duration to come and duration past are alike unlimited; and mean, though they do not say, that Jehovah is above all time, w^{a}-Nisaa', the Lofty One that inhabiteth eternity. 6 The variations are very sublime on the idea of duration lost in timelessness, before and after creation: I am the First and I am the Last; and beside Me there is no God, where still the idea of duration enters. One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day: here duration is all but gone. St. Paul calls God the King eternal, immortal, invisible: here it is the King of ages, just as it is said that He made the ages or worlds. From all this it is plain that, while the abstract idea is wanting in Scriptural expression, it is not wanting in the Scriptural doctrine. Eternity is expressed in finite terms.

1 Exodus 3:14; 2 Revelation 1:8; 3 Genesis 21:33; 4 Isaiah 40:28; 5 Psalms 90:2; 6 Isaiah 57:15.

2. But the perfect idea of eternity, as it is in the human mind, cannot tolerate duration or succession of thoughts as necessary to the Divine consciousness. And this is the deep perplexity of our human intellect, which however must accept the profound meaning of the name I AM, as teaching an eternal now enfolding and surrounding the successive existence of time. The personal Jehovah once and once only declared His pure eternity. His name is the only word which human language affords in its poverty to express that thought: such terms as eternal and everlasting have temporal notions clinging to them; and all our phrases go no further than that the Supreme fills all space and time, and that He was before them, the very word before carrying duration with it. But I AM—before Time or Space was, 1 AM—has in it all the strength of eternity. It is literally the assertion of pure existence, without distinction of past and present and future: that is, of past and present and future as measured in time and regulated by motion in space. We must accept this doctrine of God in all its incomprehensibleness, as the only one that satisfies the mind. The Eternal in Himself knows no succession of time any more than He knows circumscription of space; and, when He created all things, His being remains as independent of duration as it is independent of locality. No attribute, however, has given rise to more discussion than this. The deepest thinkers of all ages have consented to annihilate in the Divine essence all that we mean by time and succession of thought. They have agreed to speak of a Duratio tota simul, of an AEternitas in which fuisse et futurum esse non est sed SOLUM ESSE. And the name Jehovah—the Name of God and of each of the Three Persons in the Godhead—demands and sanctions this. It is utterly vain to attempt to penetrate this abyss of mystery: it is equally fruitless either to fight against it or to illustrate it.

3. Opponents of this truth deny that there can be duration without succession; but duration is succession; both words are equally inappropriate to the Eternal who simply is.

They insist also that to take from a personal being the act and operations of successive thinking is to destroy its personality. But that is simply arguing from our finite nature— which cannot think but under conditions of time and space—to the Infinite which by the very definition knows no such limits. The only answer possible to all such objections is the common apology required everywhere by this subject: we cannot search out the Divine Being unto perfection; though the perfection in which we are lost allows no past to recede before God and no future to rise before Him. When the argument takes another form, and we are pointed to the tenor of Scriptural representations that speak of the Eternal as having purposes which have been fulfilled and are in course of fulfillment, our reply must be cautiously and yet boldly given. Time is the creation of the Eternal God, Who made the ages. 1 It is, with all its endless phenomena and laws, a reality to Him Who brought it into being; and all its succession unfolds in His presence as past and present and future. Our only difficulty is to hold fast the truth that He sustains two relations to time. As the abiding Eternal One He views it in its place, Himself absolutely unconnected with it. As the God who works out for the creature and with the creature His own purposes He beholds, directs, and controls all things as under the law to time. This is of course a deep mystery to human thought: that is, to conceive of eternal willing and temporal acting, of a timeless and succes-sionless Agent working out and watching the evolution of His plans. But the mystery, such as it is, is only that of the Incarnation anticipated; and, as we receive this, we may receive that. We may dare to say that the Eternal inhabits eternity; and yet that in the Son, the Firstborn before every creature, He inhabits time also. As in the incarnation God is manifest in the flesh, so in the creation God is manifest in time. And as God will be for ever manifest in His incarnate Son, so will He for ever have in and through His Son, the Vicegerent of created things, a manifestation in time: that is to say, in plain words, eternity and time will henceforward and for ever coexist. Something pertaining to time will cease: its change and probation and opportunity. In this sense chrónos oukéti éstai, 2 but in no other sense than this.

1 Hebrews 1:2; 2 Revelation 10:6.

4. Illustrations are on this subject of no great value. And yet they are not utterly worthless. One has just been used, the analogy with the Incarnation. No exception can be taken to this: as the Son thinks and feels and acts as a man while still the Eternal God, so the Eternal God thinks and feels and acts amidst the creaturely conditions of time. The phenomenal universe is a rehearsal of the Incarnation. But in this case the illustration is as unfathomable as the thing illustrated. Other illustrations are frequently suggested which involve a disguised Pantheism, and should therefore be steadily avoided For instance, when it is said that time is the shadow of eternity, or the element of continuity amidst changing phenomena, the successional existence of God is made eternal.

Pantheism asks nothing more than this. There is indeed a dim and fleeting but an impressive adumbration of the sublime idea nearer home, in the very constitution of our nature. An apocryphal writer says that "God created man for immortality ... an image of His own being." The canonical Preacher, after describing all the ordinances and arrangements of time in their season, adds in a mysterious sentence: He hath made everything beautiful in his time. Also He hath set eternity in their heart, haa`olaam naatan, so that no man can find out the work that God worketh from the

beginning to the end. 1 The thought or the instinct or the desire of eternity for ever points the worker in time to an unfathomable mystery of the Divine purpose beyond time. Man knows or feels that he is linked with eternity and surrounded by it. This deep mystery in his inmost soul gives him desires and anticipations that transcend time and space. Sometimes this sense of the infinite or of the eternal seems for a season to annihilate the succession of his thoughts, and his contemplation of God raises him above all limitation. From this sublime ecstasy, however, he evermore awakes; but not without a dim presentiment of what time will be when it is swallowed up, without being lost, in the abyss of eternity.

1 Ecclesiastes 3:11.

THESELFSUFFICIENCYOF GOD. No notion we can form of God is more important in its meaning and in its issues than that He is self sufficient, or that of His necessary eternal autarkeia.

1. We use our own feeble words when we say that it is a necessity of thought that the Being who is the ground of all existence should be Himself an eternal necessity. All things have their cause and their end in Him: He can have no cause nor end out of Himself. He is the one, sole, self originated, independent, unconditioned and absolute Being. Here the eternal name JEHOVAH, I Amos 1:1-15 again comes in. The idea of causation carries us to One Essential Existence; but cannot go behind that It is a very loose employment of the term to add that He is Causa Sui, His own cause: He simply, purely, and eternally IS. Before Me there was no God formed! 2 To all the best thoughts and instincts of our created nature He may say: Ye are even My witnesses, Is there a God beside Me? I am the First, and I am the last, and beside Me there is no God!3 1 Exodus 3:14; 2 Isaiah 43:10; 3 Isaiah 44:6; Isaiah 44:8.

2. Although this immanent and absolute attribute by its very name shuts out the creature, and points to a Being Who needs nothing to complement or complete His perfection, it nevertheless implies that in the infinity of His resources are all the possibilities and potentialities of the created universe. When we exchange the terms Necessary, Independent, Self existent, for that of All sufficient, we begin to think of the eternal resources that are in the Deity; of His eternal power and Godhead. 1 The word Nothing vanishes before both His essence and His power. His sufficiency knows no limit but what He Himself by word or act assigns to it. Of an eternal creation we dare not think; but we may speak of the eternal possibilities of creation: of which more hereafter. From the creation of the world His invisible things have been dearly seen, being understood from the things that are made: these postulate an infinity of the invisible things behind.

1 Romans 1:20.

3. By self-sufficiency we understand all that philosophy means by the notions of the Absolute and the Unconditioned No relation in which the Supreme may place Himself— He only becomes the Supreme by relation—throws any limitation around His being. No relation is a necessary relation: in saying this we say all that is needful. Some current definitions of the Absolute have literally no meaning. The philosophy which admits that the finite cannot comprehend the Infinite, yet asserts that the Infinite cannot be a Person, cannot be conscious of a self, because it cannot have an object over against itself as subject, is philosophy falsely so called. It must issue either in Pantheism or in Atheism. It has never been proved, it can never be proved, that self-consciousness necessarily implies consciousness of something not self. Even granted that it

is so in the creature, the leap in the inference from the creature to the Creator is as unreasonable as it is certainly unscriptural. The Divine I and Thou are heard both in eternity and in time. But this leads to the next consideration.

4. The self-sufficiency of the Eternal is not fully acknowledged unless we bear in mind that within the dread sphere of His being there is a plurality of Persons. The personal Subsistences in the Godhead are eternally related to each other: and this of itself banishes the term Unconditioned. The distinction of I and Thou goes up to and enters the original Fountain of life. And here emerges the central and most glorious application of the term all-sufficiency. The Infinite Being is not the vast and unrelieved monotony of existence that Pantheistic mysticism defined as the abstract Nothing. It has in it infinite life, and, if such language be lawful, infinite variety of life, in the mutual knowledge, love, and communion of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. It was so—to use human words—before the creature existed; and it is so now that the creature exists: to this our Lord bears witness when He says, As Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee! 1 And when He adds that they also may be one in us, He raises our minds to the thought that the communion of the creature with the Creator is the reflection in time of that communion which subsists among the Persons of the Godhead in eternity.

1 John 17:21.

5. Here, then, we locate the attributes which, when creatures begin to exist to name them, we call Majesty and Blessedness. By the former we ascribe to Deity the glory of perfections which are essentially above the creaturely excellence: not placing Him at the summit, but above all; as Michael, the highest creature, by his very name cries, Who is like unto God? By the latter we ascribe to Him the most absolute freedom from all that can impair well-being and the infinity of that which by its communication makes the creature blessed. Who is over all, God blessed for ever! 1 expresses both, assigning most emphatically both to the Second Person in the Unity of the Three.

1 Romans 9:5.

THEIMMUTABILITYOF GOD.

After what has been said few words are necessary on the un-changeableness of the Divine essence. The Word of God makes few references to it save as it is implied in the eternal name: its allusions to the subject are generally connected with the steadfast perpetuity of the Divine counsels, and will be considered elsewhere. But there are some points of theological importance arising out of it for which this is the appropriate place.

1. There are sublime passages which lift our contemplation to the thought of the unchangeableness of the Eternal as contrasted with the fleeting phenomena of the universe; and therefore must be interpreted of the absolute Divine essence. These combine the infinity, eternity, and immutability of God in their glorious aggregate. One only need be quoted, the peculiarity of which is twofold: first, that it most expressly marks the beginning or the very earliest foundations of all created phenomena; and, secondly, that it is quoted from the Old Testament in the New and assigned to the Son of God Who became incarnate. Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of Thine hands. They shall perish, but Thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment. And as a vesture shalt Thou fold them up and they shall be changed; but Thou art the same, and Thy years shall not fail.1 1

Hebrews 1:10-12.

2. This attribute excludes all process of becoming, or development, and whatever is meant by change, or the possibility of change. In His essence and in all the attributes of His essential being, God is for ever the same. And of Him alone can this be predicated: any creature, whether spirit or matter, or a union of the two, becomes what it was not, and reaches a fixed state only by the Divine will: if indeed development does not belong to it for ever. And the interior mystery of the Triune Personality does not affect this truth, which is consistent with an eternal generation of the Son, and procession of the Spirit, in the interior essence of Deity.

3. In the incomprehensibility of the Divine nature, this attribute is also to be reconciled with unbounded activity or mobility when it is brought into relation to the creature; and, in relation to the moral creature, with the changeable manifestation of an eternal purpose. As to the former, more will be said on the Freedom of the Creator; and, as to the latter, we meet the immutability of the Moral Governor in His Fidelity to His own fixed decrees, whether of judgment or of mercy. That philosophical theology which loses the personal God in the abstract Absolute has greatly erred in its conception of this attribute. As the Eternal conducts the creaturely universe through an economy of time, in which His eternity is reflected, so also He conducts it through an economy of change, behind and below and above the variations of which He can say: I am Jehovah, I change not.1 Argument is utterly useless here. It is the highest reason to submit to this necessary antinomy or paradox.

1 Malachi 3:6.

4. Though there is no process of development in the essence of the Godhead, it must be remembered that the profoundest and sublimest mystery of the Faith proclaims an evolution of the Divine nature as manifested in redemption. To return once more to the essential Name, I AM THAT I AM means also I AM WHAT I WILL TO BE, 1 and forbids our limiting in any way the possibilities of Divine manifestation as exhibited in the Mediatorial Trinity, and especially in the exinanition of the Son. Concerning Him, Jehovah-Jesus, it is said that He is the same yesterday, and to day, and forever. 2 But He emptied Himself before He took upon Him the form of a servant: 3 He changed before the Incarnation, or in the Incarnation, the mode of His existence and surrendered the glory of attributes which were nevertheless immutably His. The unchangeableness of the Divine nature is not affected even by this; though no created intelligence can fathom the secret. The eternal generation of the Son becomes another generation in time: This day have I begotten Thee in human nature was said to Him in His human existence of Whom in His Divine eternity it is said Thou art My Son!

1 Exodus 3:14; 2 Hebrews 13:8; 3 Php 2:7.

THEPERFECTIONOF GOD.

We sum up all when in our own speech we say that the Divine Nature is Perfect As God is the Being of beings, His supreme perfection is the perfection of all perfections. This attribute consummates and harmonizes all the rest: representing, as it were, the undivided glory of the several rays of the Divine character. The perfection we reverently ascribe to God is unique and employs the term in a sense applicable to no other being. It is absolute, not relative; it is one, and not the result of the combination of qualities; it is necessary, and excludes the possibility of defect;

it is supreme and immutable, not the finish of a process; it is the ground and standard and source of all other perfection. By these poor sentences we labor to express the essential difference between the perfectness of God and the perfectness of the creature. But the importance of this attribute is found in its use as a reverent defense of the adorable nature from all that would dishonor it in our thoughts or in our theological systems. If we sacrifice any one attribute to any other we derogate from the perfection of God Who is the Being in whom every attribute has its supreme existence and manifestation. As it belongs essentially to God in Himself, so it impresses its stamp on all the Divine works, and must give the law to all our theological views of His character. Holy Scripture, which dwells so much on the absolute perfections of the Godhead, does not often, perhaps never does, call Him in His eternal essence perfect. This needs no assertion, nor does it need demonstration. The only passage in which the attribute is given Him is one of the very few instances in which the Incarnate Son assigns anything like a specific character to His Father and our Father: Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father Which is in heaven is perfect.1

1 Matthew 5:48.

OBSERVATIONS.

Before leaving this class of Divine essential perfections, we must impress upon our minds the following observations: 1. They are all and alike incomprehensible and unfathomable, though each conveys a definite notion both to reason and to faith or rather to that consummate reason which is faith. In studying out these absolute attributes we are in the presence of a God Whom we strive to think of as existing in the awful solitude of His own essential being; and of Him we must needs say, with more than the prophet's meaning: Verily Thou art a God that hidest Thyself. 1 Here, if anywhere, we move in the region of pure thought; and of thought which is more passive than active. We use certain terms, but when we strive to shape them into concepts we are utterly baffled. We speak of infinity, eternity, immensity or spacelessness, immutability; but our words return upon us without the exact ideas they define. By no possibility can we grasp their meaning. And yet it is the glory of our created intellect—stamped with the image of God— that we still persist in believing that our ideas of Deity are sound and true: that there is a Being of Whom all this may and must be said. Our reason is our faith; for we believe in the indestructible convictions of our consciousness of God. Our faith is our reason; for every argument leads to the conclusion that such a Being must be. This is the valid inference we deduce from our own finiteness, which is strictly speaking nothing but a negation of the Infinite: not the converse. Our very idea of limitation implies an Unlimited with which we compare ourselves. Every thought of finite imperfection implies a standard of infinite perfection: what other meaning can these words have?

1 Isaiah 14:15.

2. But, whenever we think of God as the perfection of what in ourselves is imperfect, we think as persons, and must needs think of Him as a Personal Being. Here we find a special difficulty: though it may be said that the difficulty is self-created, or rather that it springs very much from the poverty of our words. All these attributes of the eternal essence of God are described by terms that are not very appropriate as referred to personal spirit. Thus when we speak of the immensity or of the immutability of the eternal God we are applying language derived from the relations of material things to One Who is a pure spirit; and the impropriety of the terms reflects its difficulty on the

doctrine. The material notion inhering suggests the thought of a vast monotonous essence extending beyond all limit that we can assign, and undergoing no process of living development. If we change the terms we get rid of this anomaly. God is a Personal Spirit, infinite and eternal, ever the same in His nature and mode of being, and not thinking or acting of necessity under the limitations of time and space. Reference has been again and again made to the difficulties of speculation which wonders at the idea of the Absolute or Infinite being defined off from all that is not Himself by personality; but without the Infinite I speaking to the finite Thou there can be no science of God and no religion.

Theology at least should have no difficulty here. It must either renounce itself and abdicate, or accept a personal God, of whom these absolute attributes are to be predicated only as they are made consistent with His personality. The vain attempt to reconcile an impersonal Absolute with a personal thinker about it must be left to philosophy; though all philosophy worthy of the name rejects and disdains the task. The question will for ever return upon it: How can personality, conscious of itself and of its origin from something not itself, spring from impersonality? 3. Once more, it is an observable fact that this class of attributes, which we predicate of the absolute Deity, as yet unrelated to any creature, is brought into very express and clear connection with the Triune God as such. It has been seen, and we need now only to impress the fact again, that the Scriptures plainly declare the Personal Son to be eternal and immutable; and the Third Person to be an eternal spiritual essence, the Holy Spirit preeminently. To us there is no Deity but the Triune; and these absolute attributes are predicated of all that is in God. It would be hardly too much to say that they are as often and as distinctly referred to the Son as to the Father, and to the Holy Spirit as to the Son. No one can carefully read the Scriptures without seeing that the supreme Name which binds this class of primary perfections into one is given to the Three Persons distinctively and in their unity. 1 The one Jehovah—the Eternal, Infinite, Immutable Spirit—is the Three-one God. Proofs have already been given of this most fundamental truth, on which hangs the whole fabric of the Christian revelation. And, in harmony with it, we have done well to study the doctrine of the Trinity before entering on that of the Divine attributes.

1 Hebrews 1:2; Hebrews 1:10; Hebrews 13:8.

4. They are the basis on which rest, or the source from which spring, all our other ascriptions to the Divine Being as related to the universe. In other words, the perfections to which we next pass are these in another form and application: not other perfections, but yet new as exhibited towards the creature. In dwelling upon the attributes of the Divine essence, as they are brought within the range of their finite operation, it must always be remembered that the essential, immanent, incomprehensible prerogatives form the dread background of every representation. If the Divine Being gives His character and works a human exhibition—if, by what is called anthropomorphic language, He speaks AS A MAN, or adopts creaturely language—His eternal and infinite nature is behind as the standard and regulator of all: a truth of boundless importance, too often forgotten.

ATTRIBUTES RELATED TO THE CREATURE. The attributes which connect the Supreme Being with the created universe, or which derive their new names and applications from that connection, are such as may be understood by the terms Freedom, Omnipotence, Omnipresence, Omniscience, Wisdom, and Goodness. To blend them all in one proposition: The God of the universe is a self determining Agent, using unbounded power, which is everywhere operative, is

guided by infinite knowledge, displayed in perfect wisdom, under the law of never-failing benevolence. It must be remembered that, while including all and excluding nothing that may be regarded as belonging to the perfections of the Supreme revealed in His works, we keep as yet out of view the modifications of some of these attributes, especially of the first and last, which are introduced in the relation of God to moral agents in probation as such.

THEFREEDOMOF GOD.

We cannot pass from the absolute God to the God of the universe without paying our homage to the Freedom of the Divine will as assigning the sufficient reason why anything not God exists at all. This is the anti-Pantheistic attribute.

1. When we ascribe to God a will, we begin at once, as we have not done before to study His spiritual nature in the light of our own, as created after His image. Whatever else we regard as characteristic of an intelligent spirit, we cannot exclude from it selfdetermination, implying a faculty of willing or deciding its own course of conduct, the exercise of the will as expressed by purpose, and the result in act. These are summed up and assigned to God in one saying of the Apostle: Who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will, 1 where we have the theleéma, or will in exercise, the bouleén, or determination of that will, and the issue-as the act of the energoúntos. St. Paul makes all things absolutely the result of this will in the Deity, and he only sums up in one remarkable expression the unanimous testimonies of all Scripture. It is important to remember that we speak here of a will in God in the strictest sense of the term, not including the other attributes of God which may be more or less closely connected with it: such as His power and His complacency or love.

1 Ephesians 1:11

2. The freedom of the Divine will might seem to need no proof. But, in regard to an attribute which forms as it were the link between the absolute perfections and the perfections related to the creature, this needs to be correctly understood. It means that the reason of the purpose arid act of God going towards the creature is to be sought only in Himself: the will indeed is in the necessity of His essence, like the attributes already considered, but it is itself under no necessity. We may think indeed of a freedom in the eternal essence which is absolute necessity; and of an absolute necessity which is perfect freedom. So it is sometimes said that God wills Himself necessarily. This is an expression which is capable of a sound interpretation: but only if the will includes complacency. A perfect spirit must have a perfect will, and in a sense will its own perfection; but it is not, strictly speaking, more true to say that God wills Himself than to say that He is His own cause or CAUSA SUI.

3. Though the cause of all things not God is to be sought in His free will, in the eternal purpose of the Holy Trinity as an absolute essence, we cannot even speak of the freedom of that will without descending at once into the creaturely universe, the result of His free volition. There could be no necessity to create; no necessity to create what is created; no necessity to uphold. The existence of all things according to the infinite variety of their constitution, in parts and as a whole, is a display of the freedom of the Divine Artificer. The necessity of the laws of nature is the freedom of the God of nature.

4. Although the relation of this attribute to moral beings will have to be considered again hereafter when the Divine perfections are viewed in the light of redemption, yet it is right to view it now in relation to the moral government of God over His creatures as such.

Here once more we must observe that absolute necessity is perfect freedom: and we cannot conceive otherwise than that all intelligent beings are created under the obligation of obedience to a law of holiness. His moral will is the free expression of His holy nature. The ground of our obligation to goodness is simply the ground of our obligation to obey that will which is God Himself. But we dare not say with equal confidence that all moral intelligences are created by a free necessity which must make them probationary beings.

Here comes in the liberty of the Divine will in another and more unrestricted sense. It has pleased Him to make His creatures free; and to suspend their ultimate destiny on the right use of freedom. From this it follows that, in the mystery of the eternal will, its own liberty is bound up with that of the creatures. As it is no disparagement to the Divine power that it cannot do what cannot be done, nor to the Divine Omniscience that it knows contingent things as contingent, so it is not inconsistent with the absoluteness of the Divine will that its decrees are sometimes adapted to the conditionally of events. However derogatory it may seem to what is called the Sovereignty of God, the freedom of the supreme will is linked with conditional events, and is conditional with them. The entire Scripture proclaims this from beginning to end, and the history of all the dealings of Heaven with men confirms it. That God, Who willeth that all men should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth, 1 nevertheless does not actually save all men. Probation would cease to be probation were not the freedom of the Divine will adjusted to the freedom of the human. False views of the absolute and unconditioned pervade the philosophy of religion: and they are nowhere more obnoxious than here.

1 1 Timothy 2:4.

5. Lastly, this attribute of God as presiding over the creaturely universe is the attribute of a perfect Being: and we may be sure that what would be contrary to morality in our own use of the will ought never to be imputed to the Author of our nature. It is possible to make the Divine freedom conflict with some other equally necessary attributes which we have yet to mention. His liberty cannot be His creatures' bondage: His freedom cannot be their necessity. There is a sense in which absolute sovereignty in God is not only consistent with His perfection, but essential to it. He is free to appoint the conditions and circumstances of the probation of every human or intelligent being; to reveal when He will, and according to what measures, His hidden purposes, or His decretive will, or good pleasure, as distinguished from His preceptive will or command. His preceptive will itself is under the government of freedom: positive precepts may be given or withheld, may be appointed and withdrawn, may be modified or relaxed, or suppressed altogether. But the freedom of God cannot decree the unconditional misery of any creature that He has formed, even for the manifestation or supposed manifestation of what may be called the glory of His justice.

6. Finally, leaving these reflections, which belong to a later stage, let us return to the more immediate application of this attribute. It is placed first in the order of perfections which connote the created universe because it is really the first in the order of our thought. Without it the formula God and the universe has no meaning. It translates the Eternal from the region of abstract necessity and uniformity of existence into the reality of a Personal Spirit acting with free

intelligence. It accounts for all things as they have been, as they are, and as they will be. Before it the Moira, or Fate, of eternal necessity binding the universe vanishes. Before it Pantheism flies, which allows no personal will either in God or in what seems, but seems only, to be His creation. Before it also, when rightly interpreted, recedes, or ought to recede, every system that makes the probation of intelligent creatures only the circuitous evolution of a fixed purpose called the sovereign will of God.

OMNIPOTENCE. The Divine Omnipotence follows hard on the Divine Freedom: indeed it is but the expansion of the result of will in effect; in this case its expansion to infinity. It is the attribution to God of power to do all that He wills to do; according to the simple formula of the prophet: There is nothing too hard for Thee.1 He hath done whatsoever He hath pleased. 2 He can do all that He wills to do; He wills to do all that He does. Potest quod vult, in its application to the Deity, is sound theology; though the converse, that He wills all that He can, is to be rejected. Proceeding from this principle, we may dwell on a few important inferences.

1 Jeremiah 32:17; 2 Psalms 95:3.

1. The omnipotence of God is the ground and secret of all efficiency, or what we call causality. No argument, however specious, can rob us of the indestructible conviction that there is such a power in the nature of things as we call cause: that there is a connection between events which is more than mere sequence. As in regard to almost every attribute of God, but in this case with more than usual distinctness, we perceive in ourselves the finite reflection of the Infinite. We are conscious of producing effects as ourselves their cause. From that, remembering two things, we rise to the Divine Omnipotence. First, the range of our direct causation is exceedingly limited: very decisive so far as it extends, it soon reaches its term. In the interior economy of our spiritual nature it is comparatively great; in the government of our bodily constitution less; in our action upon others it has decreased rapidly; and in our action upon external nature it is gone. To the Supreme there is no limit: with God all things are possible follows, in our Lord’s words, with men this is impossible, 1 and may have the largest application. Whatsoever the Lord pleased, that did He in heaven, and in earth, in the seas, and in all deep places. Jehovah spake and it was done; 2 He commanded and it stood fast. 3 Secondly, all power in us is derived from Him: He is the absolute source of all causation. It is not simply that He can do all things; for all things that are done are done by the operation of causes that owe their efficiency to Him, though in many cases the efficiency is contrary to His will But this leads to another view: the necessary limitation or condition—if such language may be used—of the Divine omnipotence.

1 Matthew 19:26; 2 Psalms 135:6; 3 Psalms 33:9.

2. As to the display of Almighty power, it is and must be, if the Divine freedom is maintained, for ever restricted. It is not indeed a limitation that omnipotence cannot accomplish the impossible: the impossible is impossible because His nature makes it so; even as it is inconceivable that His holiness should tolerate evil. It is more important to bear in mind that the Infinite Cause can never exhaust itself: the actual must always fall short of the possible: Lo, these are parts of His ways: but how little a portion is heard of Him! Were it otherwise, the Divine freedom would be gone, and Pantheism reign in its stead. To assume that the sum of finite things is the full expression of the Divine Almightiness is to confound the faculty with its exercise: that which is irrational in relation to man is equally irrational in relation to God. This error is really based upon a notion of the Absolute

which is impatient of admitting that it can have any project which requires means for its accomplishment and thus involve the thought that God is equal, so to speak, to the production of what He wills. Holy Scripture assents to what is true in this: it is everywhere faithful to the original declaration: Let there be light, and there was light.

It may be granted that the will of God is His act, that is, when He wills that it should be so; but the converse is equally certain, that He may will not to act, and infinite varieties of being are not in existence that might be. Nothing is gained by transcendental speculations as to the identity in God of will and act. Such speculations simply trifle with words: if will means will and act means act, they fall to the ground. The same remark as to dishonest or unreal use of words is in other respects of wide application.

3. Once more, the wisdom and goodness of the Supreme conditionate His omnipotence.

Here, then, is a twofold range of suggestion: one more simple and comprehensible; the other bringing us to the threshold of unfathomable mystery. It is not difficult to understand that in the providential arrangements of the universe omnipotent agency is limited by wisdom. There is a definite and clear distinction between what is sometimes called the POTESTAS ABSOLUTA, or the absolute power that creates all at first, and places it under the government of secondary laws which represent the POTESTAS ORDINATA. This distinction between the supreme and the economical omnipotence of the Creator is important in many applications. It does justice to the regular, orderly, uninterrupted process of created things, in which occasional interventions are rare, and indeed no more than exceptions to general rule. But it gives room for these interventions in creation itself, and in the miracles which sometimes introduce a new creation into the old. The one idea of the Divine Omnipotence reconciles the two and harmonizes with both. But there is another aspect of the subject before which the human mind must bow down in amazement. In the infinite wisdom of God things contrary to His will in one sense are permitted by His will in another. This leads us up to the original mystery that the Almighty created beings capable of falling from Him; and down again to the present mystery that omnipotence sustains in being creatures opposing His authority; and then forward to the same mystery in its consummate form that omnipotence will preserve in being, not indeed active rebels against His authority, but spirits separated from Himself.

It is the solemn peculiarity of this attribute, in common with wisdom and goodness, as we shall see, that it is traversed and thwarted, so to speak, by the creatures that owe to it their origin. But the same three attributes are conspicuous in the redeeming economy: of which more hereafter.

THEOMNIPRESENCEOF GOD. The Omnipresence of God is no other than His Immensity referred to the creature, and restricted, so to speak, within the universe. There are three ways in which we may regard this attribute, as we find it everywhere presented in Scripture.

1. It is the actual presence of the Deity in every part of created nature. Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord. 1 This is one aspect; and it asserts that the Divine Essence, though not extended nor diffused, is to be regarded as present to every portion of the universe, whether more material or more spiritual. God is not present by circumscription of space; nor by the occupation of any one locality rather than any other. He is present in every force or energy of created things; nor can He be absent from any region of the universe or any act of the beings He has created. This,

with all its inevitable consequences, may be called His absolute, or, so to speak, natural omnipresence.

1 Jeremiah 23:24.

2. But there is another view of the matter which we may profitably take. In Him we live, and move, and have our being, 1 which makes God's omnipresence the presence of every creature to Him. The relation is rather of the creature to Him than His relation to the creature. Before His perfect Divinity, not extended but in its one and unextended perfection, every creature stands and moves and runs its course; every thought is conceived, every word is spoken, and every deed is done. It is this aspect of the attribute that the Word of God constantly bids us remember.

1 Acts 17:28.

3. And there is yet another, which connects it specially with the Divine omnipotence.

Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from Thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold, Thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall Thy hand lead me, and Thy right hand shall hold me. 1 This makes the God of the universe present wherever the special operation of His power is. Thus we may speak of Him as present in the mightiest and in the gentlest forces of nature, which no physical science can account for or explain without this fundamental supposition. Thus also we may speak of His special presence in places set apart for the manifestation of His glory or of His grace: The Lord is in this place. 2 Where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them. 3 And thus also we believe in a presence peculiar to heaven, and in a presence in the humble spirit of the soul that trembles at His word: the saints are filled into all the fullness of God. 4 1 Psalms 139:7-12; 2 Genesis 28:16; 3 Matthew 18:20; 4 Ephesians 3:19.

4. All these must be combined in our reverent study of this attribute. God is in all things; all things are present to Him; and His energy is everywhere felt, though not everywhere alike felt. Thus the attribute is protected from Pantheism on the one hand, and from every limitation of the Divine Essence on the other. But this subject will be more fully treated under the next.

THEOMNISCIENCEOF GOD. The attribute of Omniscience assigns to God the perfection of that which in us is knowledge, the intellectual apprehension of things in their truth: His understanding is infinite. 1 We must consider the plain Scriptural presentation of it; then our necessary theological distinctions, and the collision of omniscience generally with certain philosophical notions.

1 Psalms 147:5.

I. This perfection is closely allied with that of the Divine omnipresence: The eyes of the Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good: He knows all things as they are, because all things are present to Him. Sheol and destruction are before the Lord: how much more then the hearts of the children of men? 1 This, so far as things present go, gives a most simple and clear view of the subject what to man his consciousness is, and what the testimony of his senses tells him, all things in the universe are to Him Who is a present witness of all. All things are naked and opened unto the eyes of Him with whom we have to do. 2 It is the taking knowledge, or the marking of the procession of events, especially in this world the thoughts and conduct of men. Thus have ye said,

0 house of Israel; for I know the things that come into your mind, every one of them. 3 But it leaves that attribute behind when it includes what is to us the past and the future as well as the present. Scripture ascribes to His infinite mind the intuitive, simultaneous, and perfect knowledge of all that can ever be the object of knowledge: embracing in one eternal cognizance the actual, the possible, the contingent: Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world. 4 In our apprehension and interpretation of it, the Divine omniscience is the knowledge of the past as past, of the developing present as present, and of the future as future. Particularly, as to the future, it is Foreknowledge, which must however be carefully kept distinct from predestination: between these there is no necessary connection. Whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of HisSong of Solomon 5:1-16 This foreknowledge of persons extends also to all events, not only known from the beginning of the world, but to the end of it. Prophecy is a constant element of revelation; and, whereas prediction might be supposed to refer to certain events of signal importance predetermined in the Divine counsel, the insight into all futurity is expressly assigned to God. Jehovah, confounding the false god, cries: Show the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are gods. 6 On the other hand, He appeals to His own foreknowledge as absolute: Behold, the former things are come to pass, and new things do I declare; before they spring forth I tell you of them. 7 He sees the thoughts of men very far off, even to the end of time. What is wanting in express declaration on this subject is implied in the whole current of testimony concerning the infinity of the Divine understanding, and His inhabiting eternity, and seeing the end from the beginning. 8 As to the past, becoming the past, it is the infallible storing of the deeds of His creatures in what we may call, though Scripture does not, the infinite memory of God. And this leads to a final observation, that the attribute of omniscience is, for the most part, brought into relation with the Divine moral government, as a large number of passages might be brought from Scripture to prove. Indeed, this is the predominant purpose for which this perfection is appealed to throughout revelation.

1 Proverbs 15:3; Proverbs 15:11; 2 Hebrews 4:13; 3 Ezekiel 11:5; 4 Acts 15:18; 5 Romans 8:29; 6 Isaiah 41:23; 7 Isaiah 42:9; 8 Isaiah 46:10.

II. No attribute of God occupies a more important critical place in theology than this of the Divine omniscience. Its systematic presentation in dogmatic systems varies of course with the systems themselves. We may reduce all to two questions, relating respectively to the reality of knowledge generally in God and to the relation between the Divine foreknowledge and the Divine predestination.

1. Pantheism, and all theological speculation tinctured with Pantheism, tends to the denial of any knowledge in God properly so called. Knowledge in man is the intellectual apprehension of an objective thing known by a subject knowing it. Even when the object is the subject, as in the knowledge of consciousness, this distinction between subject and object must be maintained. But, on any supposition, the God of Pantheism cannot know with an infinite knowledge. He is conscious only in the consciousness of finite creatures; and that can never be infinite. In fact, there is no personal Being into whose one distinct consciousness may be gathered up the many consciousnesses of all creatures; and as to all phenomena that are not spiritual they are not known at all, save in finite parcels by the creature. But as soon as we accept the fact that the Infinite Creator has made intelligences reflecting His own personality, they must become objects to Him the Subject knowing. The same may be said of all material things. Meanwhile, the Infinite is

eternally the Object known to Himself. And thus we have all the elements of the Divine omniscience.

2. The Predestinarian view of the Christian Faith has required the entire removal of any distinction between foreknowledge and foreordination. If from eternity God has foreknown all that is to be, it seems hard to separate this from an immutable destiny appointed for all things. Whatever is foreknown truly must come to pass as it is foreknown. But—granting the unsearchable mystery that to the Divine mind all processes are already results— we may be bold to say that logically there is no ground for such a conclusion. It is not the Divine foreknowledge that conditions what takes place, but what takes place conditions the Divine foreknowledge. We have seen again and again that the God of eternity has condescended to be also the God of time, with its past, and present, and future. Instead of saying with the Schoolmen that to God there is only an eternal now, it were better to say that to God as absolute essence there is the eternal now, and also to God as related to the creature there is the process of succession. Predestination must have its rights: all that God wills to do is foredetermined. But what human freedom accomplishes God can only foreknow: otherwise freedom is no longer freedom. The other or determinist view is only Pantheism Augustinianised. So Augustine says: " What is prescience but the knowledge of future things? For what can be future to God, who transcends all time? As to the knowledge God has of things themselves, they are not to Him future, but present, and consequently it cannot be called prescience but only knowledge." This is not Pantheism, but only Pantheism could teach it. The same humble submission we pay to the union of Infinite and finite in the Incarnation must be offered to the mystery of an Infinite knowledge which, not in words only, but in very deed is voluntarily subjected to finite forms. The analogy is perfect.

3. We have some theological and philosophical compromises on this subject which demand brief attention.

(1.) The Lutheran divines formulated the whole subject with their wonted skill in analysis. They distinguished in relation to the objects of the Divine omniscience between His necessary knowledge of Himself and of all things possible as determined by Himself, and His free knowledge of all things conditionally dependent on His will: the former was the Scientia necessaria vel naturalis; the latter Scientia libera vel visionis. But this left room for another division, due to the sagacity of the Jesuit divines, opponents of Jansenist Predestinarianism. This they termed Scientia media, and it has been generally held by all anti-Predestinarian theologians. It is the Divine knowledge of the hypothetical or conditional as such: scientia eorum quae neque facta neque futura sunt, sed sub conditionibus quibusdam vel fuissent vel forent. There is not so much importance in this distinction as is sometimes ascribed to it. If of the Fuissent and the Forent we take the latter, then we have simply the foreknowledge of men’s acts on certain conditions: that such and such men will embrace the terms of salvation when presented to them. If we take the former, we are led to a subtle speculation which seems to some without much profit in it. When our Lord says, in His apostrophe to Capernaum, If the mighty works which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day, 1 this, if the Savior used more than merely figurative or hypothetical language, is an instance of Sciatica media, or intermediate knowledge. He knew what would have been but never was. But, when He goes on to say, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the Day of Judgment than for thee, we cannot but feel that this middle or conditional knowledge may have a most important influence on the destinies of

men. At any rate, it constitutes a most important element in the Divine omniscience.

1 Matthew 11:23-24.

(2.) The Socinians, on the other hand, boldly denied that free or contingent acts can be known beforehand, or known at all as such. They were misled by a false analogy with the omnipotence of God: as He does not accomplish all that He could accomplish, so He voluntarily wills not to know what is contingent: in other words, He knows things knowable as He performs things possible. Here we see the importance of the distinction already introduced: between the absolute attributes of God and the same attributes as related to the creature. The Divine all sufficiency is the power of doing what He will; the Divine omnipotence is the power to do all that His creation and sustentation of the universe demands, and no more. So the Divine eternity embraces in perfect knowledge all that has been, is, or may be; but the Divine omniscience knows according to the conditions of time, and all things future as what we call contingent. The free acts of His creatures are known to Him as certain though He foreknows them as free and not as dependent on His own will. Nothing can be imagined more derogatory to the perfection of God than that He should be made ignorant of contingent events. To Him they cannot be contingent: contingency is altogether a creaturely term. The notion is incompatible with any foreknowledge of human acts; for in a certain sense every one of them is contingent Even shortsighted man can be all but certain of some contingent events lying in the immediate future. In God the memory of the past, the vision of the present, the prescience of the future, are alike perfect: the very fact of creation involves all this.

THEWISDOMOF GOD. No attribute is more abundantly ascribed to the God of the universe than Wisdom. This, in human affairs, is intimately connected with knowledge: in man there can be no wisdom without knowledge, though there may be knowledge without wisdom. The analogy is only a faint one: yet we may speak of God only wise, 1 who applies His infinite knowledge with infinite skill to the accomplishment of the highest ends by the best means.

1 Romans 16:27.

1. The analogy of the human artificer wisely adapting his resources must not be pressed too far. The human agent has means at his disposal which he prudently uses to help his own weakness, and the highest skill is shown in achieving the greatest results by the smallest instrumentality. But in the case of the Supreme both the end and the means are created; and, while a final cause must be assumed for all, every arrangement in nature is a final end with reference to some most important purpose. The means are ends while the ends are means. The fundamental objection urged by many Christian philosophers against this attribute falls away when this is steadfastly remembered. It can never be said of this or that particular law of nature that it is used by the Supreme for the accomplishment of a certain purpose: it is itself, whatever it may be, a display of omnipotence and a final end of some kind. That ten thousand times ten thousand ends converge to one supreme and ultimate purpose displays; wisdom indeed, but not the weakness and patience of wisdom humanly so called. As the attribute is sometimes described, some ground is given for the assault of a philosophy which counts it derogatory to the Supreme to have need of means.

Every, the slightest, part of the infinite economy of means is a display of the Divine glory, and as such cannot be degraded to the level of mere expedient. There is no experiment in the wisdom of

God.

2. The Word of God abounds in every possible strain of expatiation on the wisdom of God in the construction of the universe, in its variety of adaptations to intelligent creatures. Whatever objection we may instinctively feel to making the Omnipotent a skilful artificer, His own Word delights in the representation. With the ancient is wisdom, and in length of days understanding. 1 This, true of man, is applied to God: With Him is wisdom and. strength, He hath counsel and understanding. Very much of the praise of Jehovah in the Old Testament is only a variation in the theme: 0 Lord, how manifold are Thy works! in wisdom hast Thou made them all: the earth is full of Thy riches. 2 But if we note carefully, we shall find that it is everywhere taken for granted that what appears like the adjustment of means to ends is no other than the evolution of an infinite series of ends all expanding and converging to an ulterior and perfect end in eternity.

1 Job 12:12-13; 2 Psalms 104:24.

3. Hence, while in the Old Testament the economy of nature is the sphere of the Divine wisdom, in the New it is the economy of grace in which it most gloriously reigns. In the provisions of redemption for the accomplishment of His supreme end we have the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world began. 1 Here is wisdom in the deepest sense: the very foolishness of God is wiser than men. 2 The attribute, studied in the light of the Cross, puts on its highest perfection.

It is now far beyond the adjustment of means to an end: it is that, but it is infinitely more than that. It is the infinite knowledge of the abysses of His own Triune Being, and of the possibilities of reconciliation with the sinner through the resources of His own essence, brought into exhibition in a counsel of infinite wisdom. Hence this attribute has given its name both to the Gospel and to the Lord of the Gospel: Christ, the power of God and the wisdom of God. 3 Here, however, we are going beyond the strict limits of the present class of attributes; and further enlargement on this subject must be postponed.

1 Ephesians 1:8; Ephesians 3:10; 2 1 Corinthians 2:7; 1 Corinthians 1:25; 3 1 Corinthians 1:24; 1 Corinthians 2:6-7.

THEGOODNESSOF GOD.

Goodness, as the last of this series of attributes, expresses the Divine sentiment which wills the good of all creatures as such.

1. It is not His excellence in Himself, which is ascribed to Him in other forms; but His benevolence in willing good and His beneficence in doing good to every work of His hands in need of both. The Fountain of life is the fountain also of loving-kindness: The earth is full of the goodness of the Lord. 1 His tender mercies are over all His works. 2 It is no less than a law of the Divine nature to make the universe minister to the happiness of its inhabitants, and to communicate happiness to all creatures capable of it. This is demanded by the ascription of goodness to God as a perfection of His nature in its relation to the creature. To this relation we now limit ourselves; and may boldly say, guided by the Word of God, that His diffusive goodness is everywhere illustrated in creation as such. As such God saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was very good: 3 in all things, man included, there was the happiness that responded to His beneficent design in the

original creation.

1 Psalms 33:5; 2 Psalms 145:9.

2. Here we might pause, as we are treating of the Divine perfections related to the created universe. But the tremendous difficulty arises that evil exists. The goodness of God is the attribute which this fact most directly confronts: not His love, which does not emerge in its glory from the ground of His loving-kindness until sin already exists; not His holiness, which likewise implies the existence of what He for ever rejects; not His wisdom, which has its grandest illustration in its making evil subservient to His designs. But it is for ever argued that a Creator of unbounded benevolence and power must, or might, or ought to have prevented the origination of evil There are only two possible solutions of this profound difficulty. Either the desperate expedient must be adopted of renouncing a Supreme God altogether: a solution this which is really no solution, for atheism solves nothing but dissolves all. Or, accepting the testimony of God Himself, we must bow down before an unfathomable mystery, and seek our refuge in the harmony of the Divine attributes. On this subject more will be said in the next department of the perfections of God, now waiting to be revealed; as also when the doctrine of Sin comes formally before us.

3. Meanwhile, it may be well to consider briefly some compromises or palliatives which are current, and, after considering their strength and weakness, make a few closing reflections.

(1.) So far as concerns our present subject, it is enough to impress the following considerations. First, we must be bold to reject every theory that makes evil and its development a form of the manifestation of Divine goodness: to that goodness evil is an unsearchable mystery of opposition. It might seem impossible that such a notion should be entertained: it has not only been entertained, but has been defended by very plausible arguments. Some have gone so far as to deny the objective reality of evil, and even of sin the cause of it. They make it the necessary form of limited nature: which, created by Divine power guided by benevolence, is under a law of development through sin and guilt and evil to a predestined perfection that will leave all stages of wandering behind, swallowed up in the eternal realization of the Divine good pleasure. The final end of the creation being the happiness of being, we are bound to believe—they tell us—that a Perfect Creator has so ordered it that what we call sin and misery should subserve in this best possible universe the purposes of His goodness more fully than a world without misery could have done. But the sufficient answer to all this is—for those at least who hold the Bible in their hands—that sin is the abominable thing that God hateth. It cannot be a designed and appointed element in the display of His goodness. Moreover, supposing it granted that for those who are ultimately delivered from sin the process will result in greater happiness than if it had not existed, this is no argument for the unsaved portion of the race.

(2.) Nor does it much help us when Predestinarian divines, abhorring this method of vindication, set up another very much like that which they condemn. They tell us that the Divine glory is the only end of creation, and NOT the happiness of the creature: instead of saying, as they ought, the Divine glory IN the happiness of the creature. They affirm, consistently, that sin as permitted in order that the justice of God might be made known in its punishment, and His grace in its pardon and removal. But we venture boldly to affirm by anticipation that both the justice and the grace of the Eternal, if we may so speak, sublapsarian in their relation to sin. These attributes were not to be illustrated by the permission of evil; but, evil being permitted, are illustrated in contending with

it. When we all say alike EVIL BEING PERMITTED, we must alike confess that an absolute solution is not by the finite creature to be found. But we cannot agree to relieve the difficulty by regarding sin as either permitted or ordained to glorify God. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that there is something inherently selfish in this argument, in whatever form put. It leaves out of view the inferior races of the creature, and all their innumerable calamities: calamities suffered also on account of the sin of man.

(3.) Meanwhile, we must submit to the clear and tranquil teaching of Scripture that the Divine benevolence is in all its manifestations controlling the evil of sin: this is the law of all His dispensations. Not indeed that He purposes to abolish it for ever; not that He has so controlled it in other parts of the universe as to save the fallen spirits from it. We have only to do with our own province of the created universe; and for ourselves we know that the lovingkindness of God is still over all His works. He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good 1 both His natural sun, as the symbol of His universal benevolence and His spiritual Sun, the Friend of publicans and sinners. The history of this world is the history of unwearied benevolence for ever bringing good out of evil. However perilous it may be to speak of the ultimate happiness of the universe being heightened by the remembrance of the evil through which it has been reached, it is safe to say that the sin of man has given scope for the display of the Divine lovingkindness in forms and in resources which otherwise would never have been known. It is the glory of faith to believe that, in spite of the woeful results of the Fall, the goodness of God endureth continually.2 1 Matthew 5:45; 2 Psalms 52:1.

OBSERVATIONS, The attributes thus summarily exhibited are here regarded as intermediate between the first series, which belong to God regarded as Alone or without the creature, and a third order, to which we shall presently proceed. A few remarks will be appropriate at this point upon their relation to both.

1. They must be understood to bring the absolute perfections of the Eternal Being into relation with the universe, and, in fact, to derive their character and name from that relation. Three illustrate this by the composition of the terms that define them: they are the Omni-attributes, and imply the existence of all things to which they refer. The omniscience and omnipresence of the Deity especially have no meaning on any other supposition. But we must be careful not to assume that every absolute attribute has its creaturely form. The Divine all-sufficiency becomes-omnipotence in the universe; but the infinity and eternity of God have no attributes of finite and temporal to correspond with them. On the other hand, when we speak of the lovingkindness and wisdom of the Creator, we cannot point to any absolute perfection on which these are founded, unless indeed we base them upon the perfection of the Divine Being generally.

2. Those attributes make prominent the personality of the Supreme: not indeed that the personality of God is in any sense originated by His relation to creatures whom He calls into a quasi-independent existence. There is no sound philosophical reason why the Eternal Spirit, contemplated before and apart from the creaturely universe, should not be a Person. With such a Being, however, we never have had, and never can have, to do in the nature of things. But every one of the attributes which we ascribe to the Creator, Director, and End of the universe belongs to a Person of Whose personality we may think as we think of our own limited and imperfect selves: saving, of course, the difference between a finite and an infinite subject.

3. It may seem arbitrary to separate this order of Divine attributes from a third having relation to moral beings. The distinction is not perhaps so clear as that between the former orders: still it serves an important purpose. With those which we have just considered the enumeration would cease were there no law of probationary trial, and no fall among the facts of the universe. Had evil not entered into the creation here the display of the Divine attributes would have closed. Wisdom and goodness would have provided for the eternal blessedness of all the intelligent worshippers of God. But the moral government of the Lord of all gives a new aspect, and in some respects a new name, with an application most affectingly enlarged, to these attributes. Our study must now be conducted in the light of redemption.

ATTRIBUTES RELATED TO MORAL GOVERNMENT.

There are some attributes, hitherto unmentioned which belong to the Divine Being as He is the Moral Governor of intelligent creatures. These are revealed especially in connection with the economy of redemption, and derive their names and characteristics mainly from that connection: though they are displayed in the relations of God to His probationary creatures universally, they must be viewed by us especially in the light of the mediation of Christ, and in their aspect towards mankind. All the perfections of which we speak may be said to hang upon two, Holiness and Love, the mutual relations, harmony and unity of which are bound up with the clear apprehension of the mystery of the Gospel. These supreme central attributes stand at the head, respectively, of many others which spring from them, or may be regarded as pertaining to the same family.

Holiness is the name which defines the essential perfection of God as opposed to all that is not in harmony with it, and therefore connotes the actuality or the possibility of sin. Its first representative in the moral government of God is Justice, which, as Righteousness, enters distinctively into the redeeming economy of that government and gives it one of its named. This is itself represented and supported by the attributes of Truth and Fidelity. The essential Love of God, by virtue of which He communicates Himself to His creature, capable of blessedness in union with Him, is most perfectly displayed in the revelation of Jesus. It is represented by Grace, as the favor which rests upon the undeserving; and this in the varieties of its display gives many attributes to the Triune God of redemption, such as Compassion, Longsuffering, and Mercy.

THEMORALATTRIBUTES OF GOD. In the two former series of perfections we have had no reason to consider their relation to moral goodness: whatever has been introduced as bearing that aspect has entered only by anticipation. But now we are altogether in a moral region: every attribute has reference to the assertion and maintenance of ethical goodness. We find that the Supreme assumes the glory of all moral excellence; that He ascribes to Himself the absolute perfection of every quality that He requires in us. We find, moreover, that the Lord of all appears before us in His word as often in His moral attributes, perhaps oftener, than in His absolute perfections. Are we to regard all this as unreality, and suppose that the God of our life is giving us an imaginary picture of Himself? We know that He sometimes speaks as if He had our bodily organization; and sometimes as if He were the subject of passions and affections of which we know Him to be incapable. May it be that the entire moral presentation of the Deity from beginning to end bears the same anthropopathic character? Does some unknown Being educate mankind according to certain principles which He has made binding; and, in order to carry on the process, teach by example as well as by precept? by an example, however, altogether fictitious? This

question has been discussed already in the notion of God possible to man; but a few observations may be made here on its relation to this class of attributes.

1. Every objection to the ascription to God of a moral character rests upon that false and unreal idea of the Absolute which saps the foundations of all theology. Carried out to its legitimate conclusion this would rob the Deity of every attribute, and reduce or elevate Him or It to an abstraction incapable of definition: the very term definition, or distinguishing from what it is not, being treason to the majesty of the unconditioned Entity. But, however inexorable may seem the logic that establishes such a notion of the Divine, it vanishes at the touch of common sense: at any rate, before the common sense of the man who listens to conscience within his heart, and has the Bible in his hand, and believes in the incarnation of the Son of God. With Atheists, Antitheists, and Pantheists we have not here to do: to them all and alike the attributes of God are nonentity. But it is necessary to warn believers in revelation against the mischief of refining away the reality in God Himself of those eternal qualities of right which His nature and His will unite to make binding on every creature. If God is manifest in the flesh, then He brought with Him those principles of holiness which are the glory of His human manifestation: He did not create the eternal principles that underlie morality, nor learn the first elements of morals from His creature.

2. It may be argued that all morals suppose a free submission to an external authority or law, with the possibility of doing wrong. This is perfectly true of the ethical relations of probationary creatures. It is not true in the abstract: it is not true of God. The Supreme Governor of the universe is a moral being, but He is not responsible to any behind Himself. He is the foundation of all law, Himself its eternal embodiment. Nor can it be established that morality implies the possibility of evil. We are accustomed to such a thought, being ourselves what we are; but a little consideration will show that perfect liberty and perfect necessity may be and are one in the moral character of God, Necessity has two meanings: it may be compulsion from without; and it may be compulsion from within, which is hardly to be distinguished from the absolute certainty of an immutable principle. This is the highest necessity of the highest liberty in God. This also was the character of the moral development of the Son of God incarnate, Who descended to the region of our human morals with the spontaneous obedience of a will that was incapable of sin: sinless, as born in the flesh by miraculous generation; impeccable, because He was the Son of God.

3. But the fundamental and more obvious difficulty here is to understand how the Immutable God can be capable of impressions from without, which the idea of passions and emotions requires. Part of this difficulty is obviated by remembering that after all much of the Biblical language on this subject is anthropopathic, an accommodation to human infirmity. Thus the unchangeable God represents Himself as hoping and fearing, uttering and suspending His wrath, vacillating in suspense, and repenting of His purposes. It is not difficult to understand all this. Woe unto thee, 0 Jerusalem! 1 is the expression of a holy wrath that suspends its execution. Wilt thou not be made clean? is the offer of mercy in consistency with that holy wrath, the intervention of a Redeemer being supposed. When shall it once be? is the language of a seeming suspense between hope and fear. The Psalmist says: Who is a Rock save our God? As for God His way is perfect. 2 He is unchangeable in His perfection. But he also says: With the merciful Thou wilt shew Thyself merciful; with an upright man Thou wilt shew Thyself upright; with the pure Thou wilt shew Thyself pure; and with the froward Thou wilt shew Thyself froward. As it were all things to all men; but we must not misunderstand the word shew Thyself. As to the so frequent repentance of God, Samuel

the prophet gives us a typical example.

He also says: The Strength, or the Rock, of Israel will not lie nor repent; for He is not a man that He should repent. 3 But he afterwards, using the same words, says: And the Lord repented that He had made Saul king over Israel. But we must be careful not to carry this explanation too far. There is a real, and not merely a conventional, difference between the attributes of the absolute Godhead and the attributes created, or the manifestation of which is created, by the creation itself and with it. We cannot understand this; nor can we understand the Incarnation. We cannot fathom the mystery that the God of eternity, 'Eel`Owlaam, 4 inhabits time also, and waits on its processes as the God of patience; 5 nor can we fathom the mystery that the impassible God should mourn and rejoice, and be angry.

It is a relief to us to see that in His Son incarnate God does tabernacle with us, and rejoice with us who rejoice, and weep with us who weep. The Old-Testament anthropopathy may be an anticipation of the New-Testament reality. Or—and perhaps it is better to say this—the New-Testament exhibition of a God clothed with human morality, and of like sinless passions with ourselves, may be only the manifestation unto perfection of a mystery that was before unmanifested.

1 Jeremiah 13:27; 2 Psalms 18:31; Psalms 18:30; Psalms 18:25-26; 3 1 Samuel 15:29; 1 Samuel 15:35; 4 Genesis 21:33; 5 Romans 15:5.

HOLINESS AND LOVETHE FUNDAMENTAL ATTRIBUTES. The manifestation of God in His moral government has in every age made prominent two classes of attributes which have for their root and principle respectively the holiness and the love of the Supreme: His holiness, which separates Him from us, and His love, which nevertheless communicates itself to the sinner. The Nevertheless here points to the most essential and profound mystery of the Atonement.

1. Throughout the Old Testament we mark the ascendancy of these two perfections in their mysterious, and as yet not fully explained, union and harmony. The beginning of revelation displays the righteous anger of God against sin, and His gracious dealings with the sinner; but it was not until the Jehovah of the covenant-people laid the foundations of the Theocracy, the formal preparative for the full redeeming economy, that the two leading attributes were placed in their correlative position. The first reference to the Divine holiness is in connection with the giving of the Law. He is never the Holy One in Genesis; but at the very commencement of His redeeming relation to the typical people, He is glorious in holiness. 1 But the holiness of the jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, 2 is blended with the love of the same God shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love Me and keep My commandments. When Jehovah renewed His covenant, after the first violation of it, the two-leading attributes are again made prominent in His revelation of His name and glory. But the love now comes first. The LORD passed by before him, and proclaimed, the LORD, the LORD God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy far thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty. 3 What this meant was then further explained: Thou shalt worship no other god: for the Lord, whose name is JEALOUS, is a jealous God. 4 Throughout the remainder of the Old-Testament economy the two great families of attributes belong respectively to Him of Whom Joshua said He is an holy God; He is a jealous God, 5 God, to the Lord God, merciful and gracious. 6 Sometimes the families of attributes are

kept apart; sometimes they are united, and their union, through the propitiation typified in the Temple, distinguishes the Psalms and the prophets who anticipate the Gospel. Bless the Lord, 0 my soul; and all that is within me bless His HOLY NAME: 7 this leads the way in the Psalm; but mercy takes up the strain and continues it to the end. The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy. 8 This may represent the psalmists: let Hosea stand for the prophets. Mine heart is turned within Me, My repentings are kindled together. I will not execute the fierceness of Mine anger, I will not return to destroy Ephraim: for I am God, and not man; the Holy One in the midst of thee. 9 It will be observed that the holiness and the mercy are so blended in these passages, and others like them, that it might seem as if they crossed hands: the holiness forgiving the sin and not the mercy. This has misled many theologians who forget that the union of the two attributes, and not their confusion, is the glory of redemption. Apart from this, however, it is plain that throughout the Old Testament the holiness and the mercy of God are supreme: on these two hang all the redeeming attributes.

1 Exodus 15:11; 2 Exodus 20:5-6; 3 Exodus 34:6-7; 4 Exodus 34:14; 5 Joshua 24:14; 6 Exodus 34:6; 7 Psalms 103:1; 8 Psalms 103:8; 9 Hosea 11:8-9.

2. Assuredly it is the same in the New Testament. To illustrate this would anticipate the whole doctrine of the Atonement. Suffice that our Lord and His Apostles gave the same pre-eminence to the two attributes. In St. John's Gospel the Savior begins by God so loved the world 1 and ends with Holy Father! 2 St. Paul makes the revelation of the righteous judgment of God, 3 the God of holiness, and the free offer of His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, 4 the keynotes of the whole Evangelical system. St.John, in his First Epistle, which is the last revelation of the Bible, singles out the two Divine perfections, Holiness and Love, for the definition of what may be called the moral nature of God. These two are the only terms which unite in one the attributes and the essence of God. This, then, is the message which we have heard of Him, and declare unto you, that GOD is LIGHT, and in Him is no darkness at all. 5 The revelation of the Word incarnate is the supreme Holiness of God: He is Himself the glory of all goodness, and the negation of all that is not good. A second revelation of the Word is this: GOD is LOVE.6 Never before in all the Scriptures had this attribute been identified with the very being of God: prophets and apostles, and the Son Himself, had approached this truth, but had not spoken it; but St. John here gives the bold and blessed interpretation of their meaning.

These two perfections we may then consider in the true order which the Apostle indicates, and show their harmony in redemption.

1 John 3:16; 2 John 17:11; 3 Romans 2:5; 4 Romans 3:24; 5 1 John 1:5; 6 1 John 4:8.

THEHOLINESSOF GOD. That absolute perfection which belongs to God in His eternal essence is, in His moral relations with creatures in whom sin is possible or present, who are to be kept from sin or saved from it, Holiness: His nature is the sum and the standard of all goodness; and it is eternally opposed to all that is not good in the creature. Thus the term unites the positive and negative ideas: always with latent or avowed reference to what is or may be contrary to the Divine will.

1. That God is holy expresses the perfection of moral excellence as existing in Him alone, the emphasis lying on the alone, whence it follows that every approach to Him must be marked by

reverence and awe.

(1.) The first time the attribute is given to Him this idea appears: Who is like unto Thee. 0 Lord, among the gods? who is like Thee, glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders? 1 And also the last time: Who shall not fear Thee, 0 Lord, and glorify Thy name? for Thou only art holy! 2 Through a multitude of intermediate passages there runs the invariable meaning that God by His holiness is marked off from every human being: alone in His moral perfection, in the presence of which all faces gather blackness and all creature? are convicted of impurity. This meaning of the word as referred to God is too often forgotten: holiness is regarded as synonymous with perfection generally, without the concomitant of separation from evil: or it is by some, in the interest of a special theology, made to mean the opposite of what it really means, the communicative goodness of the Deity.

1 Exodus 15:11; 2 Revelation 15:4.

(2.) Hence, that God is qodesh, resplendent in the glory of unshared holiness, and Agios, fearful in His sanctity, is the special ground of the peculiar adoration of the creature, especially of the sinful creature. Holy and reverend is His name! 1 His name in the worship of His people is the Holy One of Israel. 2 It is this attribute which surrounds with awful glory God in His temple, whether the heavens or the temple of earth.

Righteousness attends Him in His judicial court; but holiness belongeth to His house, which is therefore His sanctuary, the Holy place; where He takes refuge from all unholiness, while He provides the expiatory means by virtue of which the unholy may approach Him. It is emphatically seen in the trisagion of Isaiah's mystical temple; in the dread which seized the heart of the worshipper; and in the purifying of his lips that he might join in the worship of the angels. This leads us to notice that it is the attribute of the Triune as an object of worship: Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Hosts: the whole earth is full of His glory! 3 to which the New-Testament echo is: Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, Which was, and is, and is to come! 4 Hence it is obvious to observe how strong confirmation this gives to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity: this is the only thrice-uttered perfection. Neither this nor any other perfection is reserved from the second and third Persons: holiness, however, is in a peculiar and pre-eminent sense ascribed to them in common. The Son addresses the Holy Father; 5 He is Himself as Incarnate the Holy Servant; 6 while the Spirit of God is the Holy Ghost 7 pre-eminently.

1 Psalms 109:9; 2 Psalms 71:22; 3 Isaiah 6:3; 4 Revelation 4:8; 5 John 16:11; 6 Acts 4:30; 7 John 14:26; 2. All this implies that this attribute is always, directly or indirectly, related to the creature; and, as such, is the standard of goodness and the expression of the Divine abhorrence of evil. It cannot be denied that it severs God from the creaturely nature, apart from its evil. But even in that case there is silent reference to the pollution of sin which has entered the universe, of which all the worshippers, whether of heaven or earth, are conscious. In the direct reference of the attribute to mankind, however, there can be no question that the holiness of God is displayed always on the dark background of sin. It is the law and obligation of all ethical good; it is the eternal repulsion of all ethical evil.

(1.) It is the nature of God that declares what is morally good; that is the only Nature of Things which we dare think of. After all that has been said as to the foundation of goodness and the

reason why good is good, we are shut up to one only view. God alone is holy: not because He submits to a law binding on Him and on all: but because holiness has its eternal standard and sanction in Him. It is of no moment to ask whether the Divine nature or the Divine will is the ground of moral obligation. Be ye holy; for I am holy! 1 is the only answer. As every intelligent moral agent is created in the image of God, the Divine nature is the only ground of his obligation to be holy: he knows of nothing behind the nature of his God. As he is a subject of the moral government of the Supreme, the Divine will is the ground of his obligation to be holy: he knows nothing behind the will of his God. But these two aspects are really one.

1 1 Peter 1:16.

(2.) Hence, as the Divine holiness is the standard of goodness, it is the eternal opposite and the eternal condemnation of sin. Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity. 1 This attribute cannot be separated from the idea of its inviolableness and assertion of its own rights. Who is able to stand before this holy Lord God? 2 The conscience, which in the guilty is faithful in its response to the Divine holiness, cries in every sinner: Woe is me, for I am undone! 3 The whole tenor of Scripture—not less the New Testament than the Old—is faithful to the conception of this attribute, which makes it not merely retire before unholiness, but also turn against it with abiding displeasure. It not only admits no fellowship with evil, but is eternally repelling, rejecting, and condemning it. Our God is a consuming fire. 4 As the thought of the sin from which it is for ever defended is always latent in the ascription of holiness to God, so also is the thought of His abiding wrath against it.

1 Habakkuk 1:13; 2 1 Samuel 6:20; 3 Isaiah 6:5; 4 Hebrews 12:29.

3. We should not, however, do justice to this attribute were we not to point out that it is revealed towards men only through an economy of grace which renders it possible that sinners, trembling before the Holy God, may become partakers of His holiness. 1 Throughout the entire Scripture there runs one perpetual strain: Be ye holy, for I am holy.2 The ancient people heard it in this form: Sanctify yourselves therefore, and be ye holy: for I am the Lord your God, and ye shall keep My statutes and do them: I am the Lord which sanctify you. 3 And it was promised to them: Ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests and an holy nation. 4 The awful holiness of Jehovah was revealed, and for ever kept prominent by every token and symbol; and yet a sinful people might be sanctified from the world and from sin to a peculiar fellowship with the Holy One. The God whose glory filled the Temple, and revealed only the unholiness of all who approached Him, nevertheless bade the unholy draw near to be sanctified. Was it then by the rays of His holiness shining upon and around them? Most assuredly not. The mystery of this paradox, that the attribute which separated God from sinners is nevertheless the bond of union between sinners and Himself, is solved only by the system of sacrificial expiation typifying the great Atonement, which through a satisfaction offered to the Divine righteousness opened the fellowship of love between God and man. But this leads to the next attribute, or another exhibition of holiness.

1 Hebrews 12:10; 2 1 Peter 1:16; 3 Leviticus 20:7-8; 4 Exodus 19:6.

THERIGHTEOUSNESSOR JUSTICE OF GOD. The Justice or Righteousness of God is the Divine holiness applied in moral government and the domain of law. As an attribute of God it is united with His holiness as being essential in His nature; it is legislative or rectoral, as He is the righteous

Governor of all His creatures; and it is administrative or judicial, as He is the just Dispenser of rewards and punishments. Under these three heads may be distributed all that the Scripture teaches us on this most important subject.

I. The Justitia Interna, or essential righteousness of the God of holiness, need not be dwelt upon at great length.

1. It is His holiness regarded as subject to test; also as exhibited in His dealings with man; moreover, and lastly, it is rather the positive expression of what in holiness is negative separation from evil. All is said in that first ascription to Jehovah in the Song of Moses. I will publish the name of the LORD: ascribe ye greatness unto our God. He is the Rock, His work is perfect: for all His ways are judgment: a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right isHebrews 1:1-14 The last words are Tsadiyq w'yaashaar huw' in the Septuagint dikaios kai osios, and in the Vulgate, justus et rectus. The Hebrew words mean nearly the same thing: straightness and lightness, when measured by the standard of perfection.

Very frequently the Holy One condescends to let men apply the standard, and then the attribute of righteousness is always vindicated. After every test it is faultless, and far above human censure or rivalry: Thy righteousness is like the great mountains: 2 as much above man's as heaven is above earth.

1 Deuteronomy 32:3-4; 2 Psalms 36:6.

2. But it is, like the holiness of God, to be imparted to man. When we come down to the psalms and prophets, we find the righteousness of God almost taking the place of His holiness, as the attribute for the revelation of which the ages wait. When we so often read, I bring near My righteousness;1 or My righteousness is near;2 or My salvation is near to come, 3 and My righteousness to be revealed, 4 we must understand more than that God's faithfulness to His covenant would be approved in the latter day. The coming of the Lord our Righteousness 5 would bring in the everlasting righteousness of His saints made righteous through Him in the possession of the righteousness of God, 6 the imputation and impartation of a righteous character in God's own way. Hence, as the great Atonement was to be a glorious manifestation of the Divine holiness in the expiation of sin, so also it would be a glorious manifestation of God's righteousness given in free mercy to those who were ungodly, and a perverse and crooked generation.7 1 Isaiah 46:13; 2 Isaiah 51:5; 3 Isaiah 56:1; 4 Jeremiah 23:6; 5 Daniel 9:24; 6 Romans 10:3; 7 Deuteronomy 32:5.

II. The Legislative or Rectoral Righteousness of God is the attribute that stamps perfectness on all the laws by which He carries on the government of the universe, whether in other worlds or in this; and whether His laws are revealed in the constitution of man's heart, or in the written revelation of His will. What the ancient people rejoiced to remember, in their distresses, the whole world may rejoice in: The Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our Lawgiver, the Lord is our King: He will save us. 1 The entire rectoral administration of man's affairs has been conducted with reference to the great salvation gradually revealed; and this must be remembered in every estimate of the moral administration of Jehovah. We are required to believe that His law is perfect: 2 perfect as the expression of the Divine holiness: perfect therefore as the standard of right: perfect in its universal adaptation; perfect in its requirements; perfect in its sanctions. All this is summed into one sentence by St. Paul: The law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. 3

Returning back, however, to the attribute of the Lawgiver, we are bound to believe that all ordinances are righteous: first, with regard to the constitution and nature of His subjects; and, secondly, as answering strictly to His own Divine aim, whether understood or not. To believe these two things is by anticipation to answer every objection. Thy righteousness is an everlasting righteousness, and Thy law is the truth.4 Because He is righteous, His law is true both to Himself and to the nature of His creatures.

1 Isaiah 33:22; 2 Psalms 19:7; 3 Romans 7:12; 4 Psalms 119:142.

1. It is necessary to believe that under a righteous Lawgiver no living creature is overburdened with obligation: in other words, whether we discern it or not, God is a righteous Lawgiver in every department where He reveals His law. Upon every rational spirit He creates He imprints the law of obedience and love perfect and supreme; and that law is in strict harmony with creaturely nature: it is the Creator's right and it is right to the creature. But He is pleased as the Moral Governor of the universe to ordain for each a term of probation: in His righteousness He makes dependence upon His Spirit the law of continued' obedience and happiness; and the penalty of separation from His will, or sin, is separation from His presence. And, apart from the commentary upon this which history gives, every creature must say Amen: even so, Lord God almighty, true and righteous are Thy judgments. 1 Nothing is imposed upon creaturely duty, or demanded of the creaturely will, that is beyond the creature's capacity and obligation.

1 Revelation 16:7.

2. The righteousness of Divine laws implies also that they are conformed to His aim and purpose, and in this sense right. It is well to believe that they are equal and just in their relation to the creaturely nature. But that is not all. They must be measured by another standard: they are right in their perfect adaptation to the Divine plans. Here comes in our apology for the Divine Lawgiver: His own supreme Theodicy, or vindication of Himself.

It is not given to us to understand the mysteries of the hidden rectoral administration of God. We must believe now that it is righteous; as we shall certainly one day know that it is. Clouds and darkness are round about Him: 1 unbelief forms out of these clouds, and writes upon this darkness, innumerable matters of questioning. But righteousness and judgment are the habitation of His throne: behind, all is clear, steadfast, and perfect right. This must terminate human strife with the Divine Law-giver. This must settle all our disputes about the difference between legislation for angels and legislation for man; the law of Paradise with its sanctions; the gradual and slow revelation of the Divine will to the world; the eternal enactments of Sinai and the special and limited enactment for the Theocracy, with its occasional statutes that were not good, 2 not good, that is, for permanent application. Ten thousand difficulties are swept away, rather are obviated, if we remember that the righteousness of God's moral government is to be measured, not only by the creature's nature, —it will always bear to be thus measured, — but by the design and final end of the economy of His will.

1 Psalms 97:2; 2 Ezekiel 20:25.

III. The judicial administration of His own laws demands this attribute of righteousness in the equal bestowment of reward and punishment. This is called, in human affairs, Distributive Justice: Remunerative, on the one hand, and Punitive on the other.

1. The Administration of God the Judge of all 1 takes up the sanctions of His law as imposed upon moral beings in probation, and cannot be separated from its relation to sin.

It indeed gives the Supreme the new office of JUDGE, even as His love gives Him the new name of Savior. It is Judicial righteousness as it assures us of the eternal rectitude of the administration: Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right? 2 This appeal of Abraham, in the beginning of history, expresses as a question the faith of all who believe in God to the end of time, and will be confirmed for ever at the close of history. Reverence accepts this necessary truth and commits to it with confidence the destinies of all that exist. But the idea of God's judicial righteousness must be analyzed into some of its applications.

1 Hebrews 12:23; 2 Genesis 18:25.

2. This is the attribute of a Personal Judge: and all that His personality demands must be remembered. Those who deny that the Absolute Being can think, and feel, and will, and judge, renounce the God of the Bible. Even if they take refuge in the thought that He hath committed all judgment to the Son, the very committal to the Son is a personal act. Or if they fall back upon the notion that justice in the Judge means only the law according to which sin is made its own punishment and goodness its own reward they gain nothing by this. It is a personal Judge Who ordains this connection and sees that it is not interrupted.

There is but a step between this idea and that which makes God and the universe, physical and ethical, subject to the eternal law of the fitness of things. This reduces the Supreme to the position of an administrator of a law higher than Himself, after the manner of a human judge. But the very expression "Nature or Fitness of Things," betrays its own inconsistency. Admitted difficulties swell into contradictory absurdities and even blasphemies, if we forget that the Administrator of His own laws is a Judge. He does not merely watch the current that sets in for righteousness, and guide it; nor watch the current that sets in for evil, and restrain it. He is a personal Divider between good and evil: in the perfection of that principle which human nature acknowledges in itself and never can be robbed of, that every good and every evil deserves its reward or punishment, and that justice requires every man to have his own.

3. God is the righteous Judge in His constant administration in the present world. This introduces us at once to the question: How can a personal Ruler of strict righteousness administer His holy laws and yet permit sinners to live? The answer is given by the blessed truth to which all the attributes converge, that the mediation and sacrifice of Christ secures His righteousness in the administration of mercy. He is just in the punishment of all sin; His incarnate Son was made sin for us; 1 and the infinite worthiness of the sacrificial obedience unto death of Jesus Christ the Righteous is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world, 2 to the end of time. He is just in the pardon of sin; for the atonement of Christ belongs to everyone who makes it his by faith: That He might be just, and the Justifier of him which believeth in Jesus; 3 Faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. 4 Moreover, He is just during the present dispensation in mingling the punishment of sin with that corrective and disciplinary chastisement of offenders which still labors for their reformation, and so deters them from ruin. The intercession of the Most Holy Son of God, so precious to His Father, has its unbounded rights; and justice to them is the secret of that mingled mercy and judgment which makes up the Divine government of the present world. But the absolute righteousness of the

Judge has its rights also; and those who resist and reject the Atonement perish. But these are topics which belong to a later stage.

1 2 Corinthians 5:21; 2 1 John 2:2; 3 Romans 3:26; 4 1 John 1:9.

4. The judicial righteousness of God waits for its final manifestation until the great day, the solemn characteristic of which will be its vindication of the absolute justice of the Supreme in retribution of reward and punishment. The subject of the Future Judgment is far in advance. But we may here consider its relation to this attribute of the Judge.

(1.) Generally, the justice of God will then, as it must now, be maintained in its stern consistency with itself. We have all along regarded it as looking with equal eye on the good and on the evil; assigning to each its right. So will it be on the great day. The anomalies of the present dispensation will be corrected, and shown to have been only the apparent confusion which prepared for perfect harmony. Justice will be clear when it judges finally; and from its decision there will be no appeal. As an attribute of God, it will assert its reality and integrity. Two mistakes are often made on this subject. One is, to regard justice as dealing only with the sin of man. Now, it is true that one branch of the whole family of terms belonging to this attribute has been almost entirely appropriated to punishment and doom. But God is the just Judge in His rewards as well as in His displeasure. Another is, on the contrary, to merge justice in benevolence: as if the righteous displeasure of God against sin, restrained by His mercy, was limited to the reformation of the offender, the fatherly correction of his fault, the prevention of sin in others, and so forth. Up to a certain stage it is true that mercy and judgment work together so unitedly, so inseparably— both rejoicing while the gentler attribute has the richer joy— that it might appear as if God had forgotten to be angry with sin. Until the blow finally falls in this world, and not always even then, we know not if the punishment has not been only correction. But at the great day there will be no longer doubt.

Bind him hand and foot, and take him away, and cast him into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. For many are called, but few are chosen. 1 The unclothed sinner is not cast out for reformation here. We avoid both errors when we hold fast distributive righteousness. There is no respect of persons with God, Who will render to every man according to his deeds.2 1 Matthew 22:13-14; 2 Romans 2:6; Romans 2:11.

(2.) There is a profound and awful reality in the vindicatory, retributive justice of God. The specific nature of final punishment we have not now to do with: only with its righteous character. In that attribute let all who are oppressed by the dread of the prospect rejoice: let them feel its strong consolation. Be the doctrine what it may, and the language in which it is announced be clothed with whatsoever terror, still it remains that all the multitudes of the creatures whom God shall judge will fall into Righteous Hands. But theological speculation finds it hard to repose in this. It strives to take from the notion of justice what is of its essence; and would make it only goodness tempered by wisdom. "In justitia punitiva bonitas cum sapientia administratur; notio justitiae resolvitur in notionem sapientiae et bonitatis." This idea has played a great part in modern theology, though its first clear expression was Origen’s: " Ex quibus constat, unum eundemque esse justum et bonum legis et evangeliorum Deum, et benefacere cum justitia et cum bonitate punire." Again let it be said that prevention of sin and correction or amendment of the sinner are not of the essence of justice: this idea is imported into it by the definition. It required the awful sacrifice of the Son of God to unite justice and mercy; but no new definition of either is introduced by the Atonement. Within the

range of the cross the definition may be accepted on certain terms. But the cross is not within the view of either God or man for ever. Those who project its benefit into the intermediate world have no Scriptural ground for their charity. But the whole strain of Scripture is against those who deny that there is, in the strictest sense of the term, a Justitia Retributiva et Rependens at the day of final and eternal judgment.

(3.) The rewards of a righteous judgment are always dispensed to those who merit them. But it is obvious that here we are on ground which must be carefully ventured on. The righteousness of the Judge in acknowledging all that is good in man is as abundantly asserted as His righteousness in the awards of punishment. But whatever of praiseworthy there can be found in human nature is of God, whether as the effect of His preventing grace or the fruit of His renewing Spirit; while the evil within him is his own. There can be no mention of merit in any case, save as the word is used in the Divine condescension.

He Who only crowns the work of His own hands in glorifying the sanctified believer, nevertheless speaks of his own works of faith as matter of reward. God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labor of love. 1 This term adikos is used once more concerning God the Judge: Is God unrighteous Who taketh vengeance (I speak as a man)? God forbid: for then how shall God judge the world? 2 In both cases the impossibility of any injustice in God, whether as ho epiféroon teén orgeén, or as being capable epilathésthai toú érgou humoón, is left to the natural inference of every reason. He cannot, in the nature of things, that is in harmony with His own nature, be unjust in either respect. The rewards of the distributive righteousness of God are reckoned not of debt but of grace;3 and the whole tenor of Scripture proclaims that the allotments of the last day will be measured out according to the strictest rule of right: hekástoo katá tá érga autoú. St. Paul calls the last day the revelation of the righteous judgment of God,4 dikaiokrisías toú Theoú, the only instance of this impressive word. He teaches here as elsewhere that, as the punishment of evildoers will be the fruit of their own doings, and also the direct infliction of judgment, so likewise the reward of the blessed will be the righteous decision of judgment, as well as the harvest of their own sowing.

1 Hebrews 6:10; 2 Romans 3:5-6; 3 Romans 4:4; 4 Romans 2:6.

THETRUTHORFAITHFULNESSOF GOD.

These attributes—which are really one under two aspects-are, as it were, the supporters and guarantees of the Divine Justice. It may be affirmed that they are never referred to save in connection with that supreme economy which reveals the Righteousness of God in Jesus Christ.

1. Truth as a Divine perfection represents the absolute correspondence of all His revelations with the reality; and it may be referred to His representations of His own nature, to His revelation of the great system of grace under which He governs the world, and to His word of revelation generally whether in whole or in part.

(1.) God is the true God, 1 and the only true God. 2 It is observable that in both these passages, which are unique, the revelation of God is connected with the Son. He is the only veritable God, in opposition to every fictitious being; and He is the God of veracity in thus revealing Himself. We have here a sublime petitio principii: our God is the only real God, because He Who is true declares it. But the attribute is not here objective: it is rather the subjective Divine veracity in all His

revelations of Himself. As to His nature, His Triune essence, His attributes, our relations to Him and His to us, and all that concerns the essentials of our theology, we are dependent on the truth of the Creator, Who hath formed us in His image and implanted those instincts and that consciousness of Him which cannot deceive us. Our faith in universal religion is bound up with our faith in the veracity of God Who speaks the truth to us concerning Himself and our own relations to Him.

1 John 5:20; 2 John 17:3.

(2.) The truth of God is pledged to the stability and eternity of the redeeming economy as a whole. This is His absolute immutability translated into the sphere of His saying revelations. One great purpose for the good of mankind is announced from generation to generation; and to that the Eternal declares Himself true, uttering every variety of appeal to His own steadfastness from age to age. In early times the universal purpose seemed limited to one people; and to them He represents His truth. He is the Bock, His work is perfect: for all His ways are judgment: a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right isHebrews 1:1-14As the great system is further disclosed in the psalms and prophets, the coming salvation is pledged with ever-increasing strength: The Lord is good; His mercy is everlasting; and His truth endureth to all generations. 2 When it is consummated, it is by Him who is THE TRUTH; 3 and it is confirmed by the oath of an immutable counsel in which it was impossible for God to lie. 4 Hence it may be said that the attribute of truth is assigned to God mainly as the God of the one eternal covenant in Christ.

1 Deuteronomy 32:4; 2 Psalms 100:5; 3 John 14:6; 4 Hebrews 6:18.

(3.) But it is also referred to His spoken and written revelations generally, which are declared to contain only the truth of God. Speaking to His Father, He Who is the Truth said Thy word is truth. 1 There is no doubt that the Old Testament, which was then the Bible, was regarded by all who read it as containing the infallible sayings of the undeceiving God of truth. The truth of Scripture we are not now, however, pleading: only for the attribute in the Supreme that insures the absolute correspondence of every word spoken by Him with the essential reality of things.

1 John 17:17.

2. The Faithfulness of God has a more limited application than His truth. It is the attribute that pledges to man in infinite condescension—for it is the most anthropopathic of all the attributes—the fulfillment of every specific promise based upon the economy of His righteousness. Appeals to His own fidelity on the part of Jehovah, and responses to the appeal on the part of man, crowd the Scriptures. It may suffice here to refer to three most interesting illustrations of it in the economy of grace. Sinners repenting of their sin, and confessing it, are assured that He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins. 1 Believers oppressed by the weariness of the way, and their own instability, are reminded that The Lord is faithful, Who shall stablish you, and guard you from the evil one. 2 We are encouraged to aspire to perfect holiness of body and soul and spirit, are assured that, faithful is He that calleth you, Who also will do it. 3 These passages carry the Divine fidelity into the entire process of personal salvation from beginning to end. It is remarkable that this attribute is never expressly connected with the fulfillment of the Divine threatenings, though equally applicable to them. Hence, though we have located it in the family of Righteousness or justice, it forms the transition to the other and more gracious family of Love.

1 1 John 1:9; 2 2 Thessalonians 3:3; 3 1 Thessalonians 5:24.

THELOVEOF GOD.

Like His holiness, the love of God has its most direct and express relation to the creature, and especially to the intelligences under the moral government of God. But love has in this the pre-eminence, that it has an eternal and essential seat in the Triune Essence.

1. Hence we read that GOD is LOVE: in the secret of the Divine Self-sufficiency and Blessedness we have already seen the mysterious intercommunion of Three Persons whose mutual love gives God one of His Names and defines His nature. 1 If in the created universe it for ever seeks to impart itself to all who are capable of receiving it, and delights both in giving and receiving, that is because in the ever-blessed Trinity love is, as in all who reflect the Divine image, the bond of perfectness. 2 We may, we must, transfer our finite feeling to the Infinite, and believe, not that the Triune God was, but that He is, existing in an eternal sphere of love, into the fellowship of which the finite and creaturely universe is received.

Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world:3 if these words are connected with those which immediately precede, and hast loved them, as Thou hast loved Me; 4 and these again with the assurance, as the Father hath loved Me, so have I loved you; and these once more with the command, That ye love one another, as I have loved you, 5 it will appear how perfect is the identity in kind between finite and infinite love, between the reflection among us and the reality in the essential Trinity, and how profound is the meaning of those words, Love is of God: hee agápee ek toú Theoú estin, 6 a form of expression used of no other grace. The Son is ever—not was, ho oón— in the bosom of the Father: 7 in the unity of the Holy Ghost one Spirit with the Father even as he that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit 8 with Him. Thus we may boldly repeat that more glorious things are spoken of the Divine perfection of Love than of any other. It is not said that God is holiness: for, in His eternal Triune Essence, there is no room, there is no reason, for the attribute that sets up the standard of good and eternally repels evil As soon as we think of holiness we think of the creature on the way from evil to good, or on the way from perfection to still higher perfection. But GOD IS LOVE; 9 and this attribute, which is both nature and attribute, forms the link between the absolute Godhead and the manifestations of God to His intelligent creatures. The Divine holiness springs, as it were, out of His perfection to meet the creature; and is in a most important sense created with it. But love is of God, and is in the Divine relation to the universe only a hidden mystery revealed.

1 1 John 4:16; 2 Colossians 3:14; 3 John 17:23-24; 4 John 15:9; 5 John 13:34; 6 1 John 4:7; 7 John 1:18; 8 1 Corinthians 6:17; 9 1 John 4:8; 1 John 4:16.

2. The love of God rested upon the world also from its foundation: upon every intelligent creature as the love that communicates itself and takes complacency in its object. But the book of revelation, which is the record of the Divine dealings with a redeemed race, — redeemed in the very act of its fall, —reserves the attribute for redemption. It does not indeed speak of it familiarly, scarcely speaks of it at all, until its last expression in Christ is ready. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son [to be] the propitiation for our sins. 1 This sentiment or feeling in God, originating and directing the economy of redemption, was not fully revealed until the Lord Himself revealed it. And, when revealed, it is reserved for one service: to

preside over the Cross and the Recovery of mankind. No record or register of the Divine perfections, related to the created universe as such, contains that of love. His goodness and His loving-kindness are often alluded to as the nearest approach to the attribute that is never turned towards any but the objects of redeeming love. But at length the set time came for the new revelation, or at least the fuller revelation, of the attribute that governs all the rest: that which, to adopt St. James's word, is the nómon basilikón, the royal law 2 in God as in man. And love when it is revealed takes many names, or rather is the mother of a new and blessed family of attributes.

1 1 John 4:10; 2 James 2:8.

3. But, whatever other manifestations love may take, or whatever other name it may bear, it is the moral attribute in God which is His most blessed gift to the individual soul: in the administration of the Holy Ghost it is the bond between God and the redeemed, as it were their common ethical principle. We are said to be made partakers of the Divine nature1 generally, and with special reference to the two great moral attributes of holiness and love. We are partakers of His holiness 2 as being purified from sin and sanctified to His service. Bat a stronger word is used about our participation of His love. St. John points our thought to the invisible essence of God, No man hath seen God at any time, 3 but only that he may tell us in what sense we become one with the Invisible: If we love one another God dwelleth in us, and His love is fulfilled in us. 3 Soon afterwards he utters the profoundest word the Bible contains as to the relations and privilege of the saints: God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him. 4 It may be added here in conclusion that the indwelling of the Holy Ghost is the real bond of fellowship between God and the believer: He that is joined unto the Lord is One Spirit. 5 Our partaking of the Divine holiness is the sanctification of the Spirit; 6 and our partaking of the Divine love is explained to be because He hath given us of His Spirit. 7 1 2 Peter 1:4; 2 Hebrews 12:10; 3 1 John 4:12; 4 1 John 4:16; 5 1 Corinthians 6:17; 6 1 Peter 1:2; 7 1 John 4:13.

GRACEAND ITS RELATED ATTRIBUTES.

What the righteousness is to the holiness of God, that His grace is to His love: the firstborn of its strength and its minister in the things pertaining to salvation. Love retains its distinction to define both the nature and the attribute. The supreme principle or feeling, governing the Divine dealings with sinners, is in the Christian dispensation grace.

1. This word is in some respects a creation of the Gospel God was, in the Old Testament, a God full of compassion, and gracious, longsuffering and plenteous in mercy and truth;1 but there is something in the Evangelical term that surpasses all these. In the New Testament this unwearied agent of Love appears as the Grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, which is only another form of the love of God, and this again only another form of the communion of the Holy Ghost. 2 The love of the Triune God is communicated by the Spirit through the redeeming grace of Christ. As holiness comes upon the scene of atoning administration under the aspect of justice, so love comes under the aspect of grace, which is the Divine love with an emphasis upon the ill desert and utter impotence of those who receive it. Not that we loved God, but that He loved us: 3this is the best interpreter of the grace that represents in the active work of redemption the love of God which provided the redemption itself. It may be added in conclusion, that as an attribute of God each Person of the Holy Trinity shares it. We read of the grace of our God, AND the Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Spirit of grace.4 1 Psalms 136:15; 2 2 Corinthians 13:14; 3 1 John 4:10; 4 2

Thessalonians 1:12; Hebrews 10:29

2.It is needless to enumerate the other attributes or modifications of grace with which God in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, 1 is clothed in the whole of Scripture, and specially in the Gospel. They are as many as the aspects of sin and the need of sinners. Here practical theology may multiply its epithets: gathering from the abundance of the Bible, or framing them anew according to Biblical analogy or precedent. The grace that seeks the well-being of the whole race is the Divine philanthropy or kindness to humankind. 2 That which looks upon man in his sin and misery and waits to be gracious is Compassion and Pity. The Grace that waits for the sinner's return and submission, restraining the deserved judgment upon evil, is Forbearance, or Long-suffering. That which forgives him when he comes is Mercy. It is well seen that in the exceeding riches of His grace in His kindness toward us through Christ Jesus. 3 God invests Himself with every attribute that is sanctified to the service of lovingkindness generally, and that there is not much exact discrimination in their use. Finally, the grace that rejoices over the recovered and renewed spirit with delight and complacency has no name, but returns again to the source of all these perfections, the Divine and original love of our Father in heaven.

1 2 Corinthians 5:19; 2 Titus 3:4; 3 Ephesians 2:7.

HOLINESS AND LOVE AS COMBINED IN REDEMPTION.

These two attributes preside over the redeeming economy; their harmony in the Atonement, whether in the decree of heaven or in the ministry of Christ on earth, will hereafter appear. Meanwhile some prospective observations are here demanded as it respects that harmony, which is the topic of most importance. The word must be taken in its strictest meaning, and without fear of any consequences: this is a question on which the light of Scripture is so clear that we ought not to speak timorously.

1. These attributes must need, or must have needed, what we in our human speech call reconciliation in God Himself. But we should be careful how we understand and use the term. It is necessary here to carry up our thoughts into the nature of the Triune God, Who, in relation to the world as sinful, foreordained the Incarnation as the provision or expedient both of holy justice and of merciful love, Redemption is said to have been the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus, and therefore eternal redemption: before the ages in its virtual accomplishment and after the ages in its results. The Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world: 1 more than that, before the foundation of the world. 2 Therefore whatever exhibition of wrath against sin and love to the sinner we now read in the cross must be only the expression of the same wrath and love in the mind of the Holy Trinity before the world was. Nothing has been added, nothing has been taken away from it, since. The whole matter or word of redemption was settled in heaven. 3 The actuality of sin has not aggravated or intensified the holiness that for ever burns against evil; nor has the actuality of human misery deepened in any sense the tenderness of the Divine benevolence. If there was reconciliation or harmonizing of wrath and mercy at the cross, there was precisely the same in the heart of the God Who would create man. All that the Atonement means was transacted in the bosom of the Deity before the world was.

Then it was a reality. We dare not think otherwise, however hard it may be even to seem to disturb the eternal rest of the Divine nature. There is great danger to many minds of being tempted to

soften this away: in fact, to render to heaven all the love of the Atonement, and to make the wrath the offspring of earth; to regard love as the one only attribute in eternity, and justice as an invention or accommodation of time.

1 Revelation 13:8; 2 1 Peter 1:20; 3 Psalms 119:89.

2. But the fact that the Atonement was settled in heaven—the pattern in the Mount of all that was wrought out below — teaches us what is meant by harmony: it is not the reconciliation after contest, nor the agreement after stipulation, nor the accordance on certain conditions, that is meant; but the perfect concurrence of two eternal principles of the Divine perfection, — which as to a creaturely universe are called wrath and love, — in the mission of the incarnate Son and His union with the guilty world. The purpose of the Atonement was one purpose, which did not require, as we should say, two thoughts: successive, reconciled, and finally one. Hence, in speaking of holiness and love, we must be careful not to assign priority or preeminence to either. If God is Love, God also is Light, as has been seen, and that Light even a consuming fire. 1 If it was the love of God that sent the only-begotten Son, it was His holiness that demanded the sacrifice. Hence the co-ordination of the two attributes in St. John's words: Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son the Propitiation for our sins: 2 love sent Him already the expiation required by holiness. Hence also the fact that Righteousness and Grace — the two forms that Holiness and Love assume in redemption — give their names severally to the atoning work of Christ: it is the Grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men, and therein is revealed a Righteousness of God by faith unto faith.3 1 Hebrews 12:29; 2 1 John 4:10; 3 Romans 3:21; Titus 2:11; Romans 1:17.

3. But here again arises the necessity of yet another qualification. However perfectly one in their harmony, these attributes or principles of action in the Divine nature are to be kept apart in our thoughts. There is a real distinction between the two. They are not merely, as many have attempted to prove, diverse presentations of the same attribute. It is very common to say that holiness is love guarding the majesty of the Divine nature, and love the same holiness communicating itself; while justice or righteousness is a combination of the two: as, to quote an illustration, the Apostle following the Septuagint makes the sure mercies of David into the holy things, tá hósia, of David. 1 Some, who find an unreality in this, give love the pre-eminence as expressing the nature of God, and regard holiness as its opposite pole: wrath is the love of the holy Deity for all that is good in its energy as opposed to all that is evil. There is a sense in which this is perfectly true; but it is a truth which is very liable to be perverted. It is well to remember that each of these perfections is kept distinct in the redemptional language of Scripture, and that we do not find there any justification for this habit of thinking and speaking. The wrath of God is revealed from heaven: 2 not the love of God manifesting its wrath. We were by nature children of wrath, even as the rest: — BUT God, being rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us. 3 The strongest argument, however, against this absolute unification of the two attributes is the fact that everywhere in Scripture the Atonement is referred to neither alone. Where the one is the other is not far off: so to speak as its necessary counterpart or qualification. Certainly it would be wrong to say that this truth is ever matter of argument in the New Testament It does not amount to that. But it is abundantly shown, nevertheless, that neither of these attributes alone would have secured the salvation of mankind. Certainly not holiness in itself, which is a consuming fire: nor as righteousness, which would not be just in passing by transgression; nor in faithfulness, which must

fulfill its threatening; nor in any form that any of its family of attributes might assume. And love would have been equally powerless; for it is as vehement as holiness itself in chastising its object for his good, and no disciplinary correction could have met the case of sin against God. Hence whenever in revelation we find either of these supreme attributes connected with the Atonement the other is sure to be near at hand. There is no exception to this; no exception, that is, where the atoning work of Christ is mentioned. Take the passage which might seem more than any other to give love the sole honor: But God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. 4 It follows immediately: Much more then, being now justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him. An earlier passage might seem to give the pre-eminence to the justice that required propitiation: Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, in His blood, to declare His righteousness. 5 This is, however, preceded by being justified freely by His grace. Some of our Lord's earlier words might appear to make the Father's love the one spring of mercy in His own mission. But we must remember that as He approached the cross He paid the most solemn tribute to the will of the righteous judgment which rested upon Him instead of sinful man. The last attribute He ever gave His Father was RIGHTEOUS.6 1 Acts 13:34; Isaiah 55:3; 2 Romans 1:18; 3 Ephesians 2:3-4; 4 Romans 5:8-9; 5 Romans 3:25; Romans 3:24.

4. But after all there is a most blessed sense in which love must have the pre-eminence. It has been seen that in the records of that accomplished redemption there is undoubtedly an ascendancy given to the love of God which no worthy theological interest is concerned to deny. In a sense the origination of our recovery is ascribed to the Divine charity: God so loved the world that He gave His only-begottenSong of Solomon 1:1-17 It is true that God so hated sin that He sent His Son, the Propitiation: this, however, is never said, however profoundly true.

Walk in love, St. Paul says, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice: 2 he does not anywhere otherwise than indirectly tell us that Christ so hated sin that He gave Himself. This also is the truth: He gave Himself for us that He might redeem us from all iniquity; 3 and, Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity: therefore God, even Thy God, hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows. 4 But it is rather His love of sinners than His love of righteousness that is appealed to and magnified throughout the New Testament. GOD is LOVE; and we must, in our homage to this perfection, reverently think that it was not the holiness which asked, in the eternal counsel, what love could do, but the love which offered the unspeakable gift: Cháris toó Theoó epí teé anekdieegeétoo autoú dooreá. 5 And. as in the origination of the redeeming economy, so also in the process and final issues of it, love has the pre-eminence. It is everywhere magnified by God the Father and His incarnate Son; and we must magnify it. Mercy and judgment are on either side of the cross; they co-operate in all the administration of the Gospel; and they will preside at the final day. But evermore judgment executes the will of mercy, or love, the royal law; 6 even when justice may seem to use the ministry of love. Our theology, like David, must sing of mercy and judgment. 7 But still Mercy rejoiceth against judgment: 8 exults or triumphs not OVER it, indeed, but yet AGAINST it. The same Moralist among the Apostles who made love the law, says: katakauchátai éleos kríseoos.

1 John 3:16; 2 Ephesians 5:2; 3 Titus 2:14; 4 Hebrews 1:9; 5 2 Corinthians 9:15; 6 James 2:8; 7 Psalms 101:1; 8 James 2:13.

HOLINESS, RIGHTEOUSNESS, AND LOVE.

Finally, we may consider the union of these attributed in the Atonement as administered in the Gospel. That administration is mediatorial: while the attributes are the perfections of each Person in the Godhead, they are generally regarded as displayed by the Father, through the intercession of the Son, by the ministry of the Holy Ghost. And they are displayed in three departments of the economy of grace. The Supreme Judge presides in the mediatorial court where righteousness reigns; as a Father He dispenses grace in the household and family of His adopted and regenerate children; and as God in His temple He sanctifies His worshippers to Himself: all through the mediation of the incarnate Son, and the influences of the Holy Spirit. To the first answers the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ; 1 to the second the love of God; and to the third the communion of the Holy Ghost.

1 2 Corinthians 13:14.

1. In what we hare termed the Mediatorial Court, God's relations to man, or rather man's relations to God, are altogether those of law. God is the Judge; there reigns His righteousness; the Atonement is a satisfaction to justice; Jesus Christ the Righteous is the Advocate; sin is transgression; repentance is conviction; acceptance with God is the righteousness of faith, imputed and imparted; and the whole Christian system is the new law of faith. Now in this Evangelical court, all the Divine-moral perfections which cluster around or arise out of His justice have their manifestation, and are glorified.

2. In the temple of Christianity the presiding attribute is holiness. There the holy God reigns over the propitiatory, sprinkled with the blood of expiation. There the Redeemer is the High-priest of our profession. Sinners polluted approach the altar and are sanctified, purified, consecrated to the Divine possession, fellowship, and service. The Christian system is the consecration of a holy life, and Christians partake of the Divine holiness.

Over a large variety of terms describing the Evangelical privilege this sanctuary attribute presides, uniting God and His saints in one most holy communion.

3. Midway between these, and yet as the crown and consummation of both, is the household and family of God, where He dwells as a Father in the midst of His adopted and regenerate children, united to Him in His Son the Firstborn among many brethren.1 There His love supremely reigns. It reigns, indeed, in the court and the temple; but here it supremely reigns, glorified in the face of the Incarnate, and from it shining upon all His children. The Christian system becomes now a family discipline: the sons of God are imitators of Christ, and keep the commandments as children obeying their Father's voice in love. Here we may reverently say is the perfection of the Christian economy as a display of the perfections of God in Christ. The Atonement— an expiation in the temple, and a satisfaction in the court—is the reconciliation: the reconciliation of the Father and His prodigals in the Son incarnate. Through this reconciliation, and the indwelling of the Spirit of the Son, believers are restored to the image of Him Who is the Image of the Father: changed into the same image from glory to glory even as by the Spirit of the Lord,2 and thus reaching the goal of their destiny whom He did predestinate to be conformed to the image of HisSong of Solomon 3:1-11 1 Romans 8:29; 2 2 Corinthians 3:18; 3 Romans 8:29.

4. But, though we thus decompose and distribute the Divine attributes in redemption, they combine into one harmonious glory of grace. The three are one; and the bond of their perfectness is Love. To this subject we return in due time when the administration of redemption is our subject

SUMMARY. A few closing remarks may be made, both dogmatic and practical, on this inexhaustible subject.

1. The meditation and study of the Divine Attributes lies at the foundation of theology, which is by the very term the doctrine of God contemplated in Himself and in His universal relations, or in the universal relation of all things to Him. The whole superstructure of this holy science might be reared upon the several names and perfections of the Most High; and, whether formally aiming at it or not, our divinity is sound only in proportion as it is remembered. There is not a single truth of our dogmatics or ethics which might not be assigned as it were to its natural place under the several heads of the preceding distribution. But the attempt to do this, as it would overtax in many respects our ability, so it would not on the whole conduce to our advantage as students of systematic theology. Hence we must be content to make the Divine nature and perfections part only instead of the whole. But, for this very reason, a treatment of the various attributes, more elaborate and comprehensive than that which has been attempted, is needless at the outset: just as their rays are diffused and blended throughout the Scripture, so are they, as it will be found, more or less interwoven with all the topics we shall hereafter discuss.

2. As the consistent and universal exhibition of the Divine perfections in their harmony is the glory of our science, so all its confusion, and dimness, and vexation have been due to the errors of men’s conception of them: the history of the heresies, major and minor, of the Christian dogma is little more than the history of the systematisation of such unworthy apprehensions of those perfections. Hence, their equal honor and perfect harmony should be the standard of our aspiration in every step that we take: abstaining from the invention of attributes that God has never given to Himself, we must evermore seek to do full justice to all and to each of those which He has revealed. The safeguard of truth is in this harmony. It is a standard to which by the help of the Scripture, nowhere more rich than on this subject, we may constantly and. safely bring our views of Divine things. For instance, an attribute of Sovereignty, or Absolute Sovereignty, is sometimes assigned to the Divine Being in a peculiar meaning for which the Scriptures-give no warrant. Most assuredly the Supreme is, by the evidence of this very name, high above all restraint, the uncontrolled Disposer of all events. He is the Only Potentate. 1 There is a sense of course in which all things that are to take place may be traced to the Divine will, which we may reverently term absolute if we desire. Moreover, with reference to some events, and some providential arrangements, the Word of God does sometimes represent Him as pointing to His sovereign pleasure, from which there is no appeal, and into the reasons of which no mortal must seek to penetrate. But it may be denied that any such attribute as that of Sovereignty is to be found mentioned in Scripture; certainly that it is placed, where much human theology places it, at the head of all the attributes, alone sternly ruling the whole economy of revelation. At any rate God is pleased to order His wisdom and His love, and His grace which is the expression of both, in most affecting juxtaposition with His uncontrolled and uncontrollable will: He Who is the Only Potentate,2 is also the Only wise God, 3 and God is love. 4 On the other hand, this last attribute of love itself has sometimes assigned to it an absolute sovereignty of its own which dissipates the gloom of the other system by a light not borrowed from heaven. This we have sufficiently seen.

And it may be enough generally to repeat, what cannot be too profoundly pondered, that the Holy Spirit has displayed the economy of the Divine perfections in such a way as to forbid every exaggeration of any one of them, and to encourage us to harmonies the whole.

1 1 Timothy 6:15; 2 1 Timothy 6:15; 3 Jude 1:25; 4 1 John 4:16.

3. Once more, the study of the Divine perfections should be conducted habitually, reverently, and most devoutly, with reference to our own edification. The benefit of this is literally incalculable and inexhaustible, if we contemplate them with a never-failing reference to our soul's good: either endeavoring to rise to them or bringing them down to ourselves. We cannot indeed reach them; they are high and they are deep. But the very contemplation of perfections which oppress the mind strengthens the mind which it oppresses. To be amazed, and confounded, and baffled by our thoughts of God is the noblest discipline of the human regenerate spirit. But, though we cannot attain to them, we may—in the right sense of the word, however—bring them down to us. What this means is best taught by Scriptural examples. Let two stand for an endless series. Mark Job's struggle and submission in the presence of the Divine Omniscience. His consolation is that, though God is inscrutable to His creature, His creature is perfectly known to Him: Behold, I go forward, but He is not there; and backward, but I cannot perceive Him: on the left hand, where He doth work, but I cannot behold Him: He hideth Himself on the right hand that I cannot see Him. But He knoweth the way that I take: when He hath tried me I shall come forth as gold. 1 And David's more tranquil and equally sublime reduction to himself of the Divine Omnipresence. Meditating upon the presence of God which fills the universe, from which nothing is or can be concealed, he cries: Such knowledge is too wonderful for me: it is high, I cannot attain unto it. 2 He despairs of pursuing this track; and we all despair with him. But his meditation regards God as thinking of his own poor destiny and interests: How precious also are Thy thoughts unto me, 0 God! how great is the sum of them! If I should count them, they are more in number than the sand: when I awake, I am still with Thee. 3 And then he places the secrets of his own spirit in the light of that omniscience. He brings that awful attribute to bear upon himself. Search me, 0 God, and know my heart; try me, and know my thoughts: and see if there be any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting.

1 Job 23:8-10; 2 Psalms 139:6; 3 Psalms 139:17-18; Psalms 139:23-24.

4. But the way everlasting suggests a truth which every Christian theologian should remember: that the Divine perfections must be contemplated as they are manifested and made incarnate in our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. He is the sum of Divine attributes in human nature. In Him the infinite and the finite are everlastingly one. The Incarnation is an eternal fact: in purpose before time was, in reality now and for ever. We are not called to study the absolute and immanent perfections in themselves, nor in Himself the Being Who is invested with them. We have as men no God Who is not revealed in Jesus; nor need we ever contemplate Him apart from our own nature in Christ. We shall never see and never know God save as revealed in the face of His incarnate Son. In Him we see these attributes which connect the Supreme with the creature under a most blessed and peculiar aspect; especially those of omnipresence, omniscience, and omnipotence: the omni-attributes. In Him, reflected from His face, and reflected through His work, we see the glory of the perfections that bring the Divine into relation with human redemption from sin. We all with unveiled face reflecting as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the

same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord. 1 It may be supposed that what is primarily meant here is our common reflection of the moral image of God exhibited in the human virtue of the Son's holiness. But we have no right to limit our view rigidly to this. One with the Son—He that is joined unto the Lord is One Spirit 2 — we are, in a certain sense, in Him one with the Holy Trinity, and made partakers of the Divine nature. 3 In the likeness of the Triune we were originally formed. The finest dust of the material universe contributed the body which connected us with the other orders of the Creature; but it was the Spirit of God Who gave us the higher essence on which was stamped the Divine image. In our perfection in Christ we shall be restored to the most consummate reflection of every attribute of the Creator which is possible to the creature. As to the absolute attributes, and our reflection of them, there is a mystery at present unfathomable. But as to the attributes which depend on the holiness and love of the Divine nature, we must study them not only in the volume which reveals the Supreme but in the Person and Work of the Son, In His work they have their atoning aspect; and there we study them as the ground of our redemption and hope. In His Person they have their passive and active exhibition as the perfect example of human holiness. Beholding and reflecting the glory of the Divine-human character of Christ, we study the attributes of God where alone we can study them unto perfection. No department of Scriptural Theology, as such, is so abundant as that which trains our minds to contemplate the perfections of the Supreme, and to dwell upon the works and ways of God as manifestations of His character, or of His glory. The several attributes are constantly set before us, some for our adoring wonder, and some for our imitation; and they are blended into the unity which is the glory of that Divine nature of which we may be partakers.

1 2 Corinthians 3:18; 2 1 Corinthians 6:17; 3 2 Peter 1:4.

5. Finally, though the incarnate Son has fully revealed the Father as such, and the Triune secret of the Divine essence, He has introduced no change in the exhibition of the Divine attributes generally. There is nothing more remarkable in the Bible as a whole than the substantial unity and identity of the Being Whom it describes in a series of revelations running through thousands of years. The consistency of the Holy Scriptures in this respect is one of its most glorious characteristics, and one of its strongest credentials.

There is nothing in all the religious literature of mankind—and that literature is very large—which can be brought even into comparison, much less into competition, with them. This is true of the Scriptural names of the Deity; but it is more abundantly true of the perfections in which those names are enshrined. The noblest conceptions of the Godhead to be found outside of the Bible are found connected with the most degrading; nor is there one hymn, or one meditation, in all Gentile theology which gives a presentation of the Divine character either perfectly honorable to God Himself or perfectly satisfying to the soul of man. But from the beginning to the end of the revelation which we accept as Divine there is not one discordant note; the Being Whom it presents may not be at all points what human fear or hope could in its diversified moods desire; but He is ever the Same, a Being in whose presence unholiness is rebuked and all goodness or tendency to goodness is encouraged and quickened into life. From that almost the first announcement to a personal worshipper, I am the Almighty God; walk before Me and be thou perfect, 1 through all the annals of Scripture, there is the same God Whose character is the standard of perfection, Whose almightiness or all-sufficiency is the source of strength, and Whose manifested Presence is the light and joy of life.

Everywhere we find the great quaternion of names which combine His essence and His attributes. God is JEHOVAH, 2 the absolute Being; He is SPIRIT, 3 the personal object of worship: He is LIGHT, 4 repelling all impurity; He is LOVE, 5 diffusing His goodness as grace for ever.

1 Genesis 17:1; 2 Exodus 6:3; 3 John 4:24; 4 1 John 1:5; 5 1 John 4:8.

11. Vol 01 - Creation

Creation GOD AND THE CREATURE.

CREATION THE CREATION: GOD The Holy Trinity;

Divine Attributes in Creation PRIMARY OR PROPER CREATION

OPPOSED SYSTEMS

Pantheism;

Polytheism;

Dualism;

Materialistic Atheism;

Antitheism;

Agnosticism;

Scientific Materialism;

Positivism SECONDARY CREATION, OR COSMOGONY THE MOSAIC COSMOGONY EXTRA-BIBLICAL COSMOGONIES

EVOLUTION Cosmical and Organic Development MOTIVE AND END OF CREATION THE CREATED UNIVERSE ANGELS AND SPIRITS THE MATERIAL UNIVERSE:

Matter and the Cosmos

MAN

Divine Image;

Natural and Federal Unity;

Hypothesis as to his Origin;

Unity, and Antiquity on Earth;

Elements of Human Nature

CREATION

PROVIDENCE. THE discussion of the Divine Attributes has prepared us for a universe that is not God, but brought into existence by His power, and the object of His providential conservation, care, and government. The two departments of our present subject are, therefore, the Creature and Providence. The former will include all the several orders of created nature; and the latter, the general principles which are revealed as controlling their destiny: in other words, the What and the

Why of the universal Creation of God. THE CREATURE. The creaturely universe, embracing immaterial intelligences or angels, the world of material elements, and man uniting the two in himself, owes its being to the act of the Triune God, Whose will called it into existence. The revelations of Scripture on this subject may be distributed under the two heads of the Creator in regard to the act of creation, and the several orders of the creatures as the result of His creating act. THE CREATOR.

Creation is in Scripture assigned to the One Almighty God, in the Trinity of His essence: the Son and the Holy Spirit having the same special relation to the production of all things which they afterwards bear to the redemption of the world. The creating act displays the glory of the Divine attributes, but freely as an act of will, and with the diffusion of happiness as one end attained by the resources of infinite wisdom. Absolute creation is the effect of omnipotence; but the origination of creaturely existence is a mystery which is revealed for adoration only, no other account being given or possible but the all-sufficiency of the Creator. Secondary creation, or the Formation of the material part of the universe into order, exhibits Divine wisdom also and love as preparing the scene of Providence for all living creatures, of probation for all moral intelligences, and of redemption for fallen man. THE TRINITY IN CREATION.

Allusion has been already made to the Redemptional Trinity as the manifestation of the Eternal Triune One in the salvation of man. Between these may be interposed an Economical Trinity, in some sense mediatorial, but not redemptional: the revelation, that is, of Three Persons after a special manner and order in the production of the universe.

1. Each Person is in Scripture plainly connected with the act of creation: plainly, that is, according to the universal law of gradual development that has been so often referred to. The Old Testament dimly but not uncertainly gives its evidence, when its words are interpreted in the light of the New. My Father worketh hitherto, 1 is our Lord’s testimony, and I work: not so much indicating successive stages as claiming for Himself all Divine acts, and making them His own: the Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He seeth the Father do. The Father here is the eternal Father; for, the eternal Second Person, both as The Word and as The Son, is expressly asserted to be the author of creation. All things were made by Him. 2 St. John’s witness is repeated and confirmed by St. Paul, All things were created by Him; 3 and this in a passage which declares that the Son of His love was the Firstborn of every creature: prootótokos, begotten before all creaturely existence.

These passages in their combination lead our minds to our Lord’s only other reference to creation: Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world. 4 To this give all the Scriptures witness. Carrying the evidence back now to the Old Testament we find that it renders to the Spirit the same tribute which the New renders to the Son. Thou sendest forth Thy Spirit, they are created; 5 and, before the words Let us makeMan 1:6 we read that the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. The doctrine of the Essential Trinity gives harmony and consistency to the whole. Without it the entire fabric of Scripture is unintelligible: it ceases to be a fabric; it is itself without form and void, and darkness rests upon its entire face.

1 John 5:17; 1 John 5:19; 2 John 1:3; 3 Colossians 1:15-16; 4 John 17:24; 5 Psalms 104:30; 6 Genesis 1:26-27.

2. But there is evidently an Economical Trinity here, the foreshadowing of the Redemptional. What man's word is to his act, the expression of his will, the Eternal Word was in creation: By Whom also He made the worlds, 1 where the Word is the Son who is the Mediator of the creation of the aioónas, or orders of worlds, which He sustains by the word, toó reémati, of His power. His omnipotence as God and His mediatorship as the Word in the created universe are one. The dia, generally used, also indicates this. He is the Mind and Will and Act of His Father. This economical relation does not so expressly extend to the Holy Spirit; but we have seen that of Him also as of the Son it may be said, without Him was not anything made that was made. 2 All this is revealed for the suppression of the notion that matter, or the substance of the visible universe, is eternal; or, supposing it created, that any inferior Demiurgus was employed in the creation; also for the establishment of our faith in the worthiness of all created things: and, finally, to show that the scene of creation was prepared as to be in due time the scene of redemption also.

1 Hebrews 1:2; 2 John 1:3. THE DIVINE ATTRIBUTES IN CREATION.

We have already anticipated our present subject when considering the Divine Attributes in relation to the creature. It is enough to say here that the omnipotence of God, as the outward manifestation of His interior all-sufficiency, is enough for the original production of matter in what may be called absolute creation, that His wisdom and power are seen in the secondary creation or formation of matter into worlds; and that the end of all is the expression of the Divine perfections or their reflection in the works of His hands.

CREATION PROPER.

It is only in the Divine All-sufficiency that we can find the ground of the origin of all things that exist not being God Himself. In this we must be content to seek the possibility of all forms of being, spiritual or material; known to us or unknown; our own universe, so far as we may call it ours, and other universes that may be behind it, with others that may follow it. The utmost that human thought can rise to is this, that with God all things are possible: 1 that is, all things possible may, at His will, become actual. In one sense there is no NIHIL to infinite resources, and the maxim "Ex nihilo nihil fit" must either be converted into "In nihilo omnia fiunt," or limited to created agents, with regard to whom it is undoubtedly true. It is the uniform testimony of Scripture, and its fundamental error in the opinion of modern Pantheists, that the Eternal and only Being by His will and word brought all things that are not Himself into an existence which in no ultimate elements they had before. The testimony to this supreme truth is positive and negative.

1 Matthew 19:26.

1. Positively, the beginning of revelation asserts this: In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. 1 These words concerning the old creation are repeated when the new creation is introduced: In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him. 2 In that beginning, which baffles human thought to apprehend, the Son already is as God, and all things BECOME or are made. Hence the same revealing voice which declares the Divinity of the Son declares in contrast the origination in time or with time of all things. We may pass over the many passages which assert the Divine origin of the ordered Cosmos: they might be supposed consistent with the existence of a substance out of which it was arranged. But the incarnate Savior prays, Glorify

Thou Me with Thine own Self with the glory which 1 had with Thee before the world was: 3 where pará soí corresponds with the glory as of the Only begotten pará Patrós. 4 And in this light the many testimonies to the creation of all things must mean the bringing them into existence proper. By Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities or powers: all things were created by Him and for Him: and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist. 5 The contrast between the essential being of the Son in the Father, and the created existence of all things else, could not be more clearly laid down. In a very remarkable passage St. Paul declares the possibilities of God to be Tá aórata autoú, the invisible things of Him. 6 What He in the freedom of His omnipotence brings into visible existence proclaims His eternal Power and Godhead: the dúnamis here preceding, and measuring, and, as it were, determining the theiótees, while, on the other hand, the theiótees, or divineness of God, is the substratum of that dúnamis, the resources of which are infinite. What has been clearly seen from the creation of the world is but the manifestation of an invisible infinity of power behind. But there is a still nearer approach to the calling all things out of nothing in another word of St Paul concerning God Who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were: Rom tá meé ónta hoos ónta. 7 Hence we may accept our very term "ex nihilo " from the Vulgate: " Peto, nate, ut aspicias ad coelum, et terram, et ad omnia quae in eis sunt; et intelligas quia ex nihilo fecit illa Deus, et hominum genus;" thus rendering a passage which the Apostle might have in view, ex ouk onton epoihsen auta ho Theos. In the Epistle to the Hebrews the first article of the faith is the primitive creation as distinguished from the formation of all things. Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear: eis tó meé ek fainoménoon tó blepómenon gegonénai. 8 The construction and the absolute origination of all things seen are, in fact, separated, and then united. The creating word of God is set over against both: all things were formed by the Divine word in order that faith might lay hold of the truth, which reason cannot penetrate that the created universe did not spring by development from things previously existing, but from the invisible creating power of One afterwards referred to as tón gár aóraton, Him Who is invisible.9 With this the revelation of Scripture has spoken its last word, after which the first word of science must begin.

1 Genesis 1:1; 2 John 1:1-3; 3 John 17:5; 4 John 1:14; 5 Colossians 1:16-17; 6 Romans 1:20; 7 Romans 4:17; 8 Hebrews 11:3; 9 Hebrews 11:27.

2. Negatively, the Scripture precludes any other doctrine than that of an absolute creation of all things by the direct act of the Divine will. It omits any allusion to pre-existing forms of matter, animate or inanimate, out of which the present universe was through long periods developed. Physico-theological speculation may interpose universe after universe, or rather universe before universe, to carry up the continuity of cause and effect nearer to the final source; but at length it must come to the unsearchable chasm between phenomenal things and the eternal essence. Platonic ontology may go farther and contrast phenomena as they are made to appear with the eternal ideas appearing only to God Himself; but the kosmos nohtos in the Divine mind is not creation, and it is of creation we now speak The negative argument is found in all those many passages which bring the Jehovah-name into relation with created things. This is the Scriptural method of proclaiming the infinite and to us unthinkable chasm between necessary being and existence phenomenal. The Bible does not say, in philosophical language, that the Unconditioned

One remains the Unconditioned while He creates the conditioned, or that the one Necessary Being cannot have other necessary existence, co-eternal with Himself, which He forms into the universe. But it simply says, in Nehemiah's language, which is the language also of psalm and prophet: Thou, even Thou, ART JEHOVAH ALONE ; Thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth, and all things that are therein, the seas, and all that is therein, and Thou preservest them all. 1 Its doctrine is everywhere that the Eternal can clothe Himself with what garments visible He will; in modern language, it teaches that the creating act is the finite expression of the Infinite. The creation is referred to as its free exercise: all things requiring God as their First Cause, but the First Cause not requiring the creation by any necessity of His nature.

Speculations as to the necessary connection of power and act in the Immutable Being, and therefore as to the necessity of an eternal creation—speculations which forget the difference between the Infinite and the finite, a difference which is to us at once conceivable and inconceivable—are utterly unknown in Scripture.

1 Nehemiah 9:6.

THEORIESCONTRADICTINGTHE DOCTRINE OF CREATION.

It is at this point that we are met by those hypotheses which flatly contradict the doctrine thus laid down as Scriptural, and as alone consistent with the true notion of God and His universe. These have been alluded to in their relation to the doctrine of God Himself; but briefly, as the present is their proper place. It may be boldly asserted that Pantheism and Materialism, with a third class of intermediate theories that are composed of elements derived from both, owe their origin not to an anti-Theistic sentiment, but to the difficulty of accepting God as the Creator, primarily and absolutely, of anything that is not God.

What is here said about them will be confined to a brief consideration of their bearing on the subject of creation.

PANTHEISM.

Many definitions may be given of this system of thought, which has had the longest, the most diversified, and the most persistent sway in the annals of human error. But no definition does justice to it which forgets that it is a theory of the universe making God supreme in it without being its Creator: identifying, in fact, God with the universe, or the universe with God: to par Theos esti. But there are two kinds of Pantheism, which are not perhaps distinguished as they should be in reviews of its history. All Pantheism is not the same Pantheism.

1. It cannot be said of the ancient Indian philosophies that they made God and the universe one. What to the Hondo in every age—as long before the Christian era as since—has been the Supreme God, or the abstract Brahm without predicate, exists without a necessary finite created system. This eternal, infinite, immutable Being is sublimely above all creaturely nature. When the repose of incalculable ages is broken, He or It comes as to the creature into existence, is developed to creaturely thought in manifold forms for long ages, and then withdraws into Himself or Itself the whole panorama of phenomenal being to be remembered in their forms no more. Now in this wonderful system of thought, the essential idea of creation cannot be concealed or

suppressed. The Hondo Trinity itself, Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva, is only a representative personification of the Supreme in acts which are not far wide of the Scriptural ideas of creation, preservation, and destruction, at least as far as the two former are concerned; all the phenomena of the universe, on the way to nothing, are surely supposed to be brought into separate existence that the Infinite may appear in them before they go hence; and that separate existence, as separate, they lose when they cease to be. It is true that the entire system may be called, in modern language, pantheistic. But there is a vast difference between its view of the supremacy of the Original of all things which He again withdraws from being and the pure Pantheism that identifies and makes one whole God and the universe.

2. No form of ancient Greek philosophy was Pantheistic in the fullest and deepest sense of the word. From Thales through Plato down to the last of the Stoics the philosophers were occupied with the origin of things. Some denied creation, but they denied also God: such were the earliest of the Ionic school, who strove to find the unity of all phenomena, whether in water, or in air, or in fire; but whatever they called the soul of the world, animating and controlling the endless flux of things, it was not the god of Pantheism. Their system was Materialism in disguise. Others, as those whose names are the glory of the Socratic school, laid too much stress on the supremacy of the all-controlling mind to be counted Pantheists: moreover, they were always haunted by the notion of an eternal húleen, or matter, as it were something mediatory between matter, as we know it, and pure spiritual being. What they called the Soul of the World, the active principle, namely, which frames and forms and fashions all things, could never be detached from the Stoic conception of matter, and so far their system might be called Pantheistic But their Natura naturans, or ho phusis technikh, was, by the term, an operative mind, as Cicero says: " Natura, non artificiosa solum, sed plane ARTIFEX ab eodem Zenone dicitur; consultrix, et provida utilitatum opportunitatumque omnium. Censet enim artis maxlme proprium est creare et gignere, quodque in operibus nostrarum artium manus efficiet, id multo artificiosius naturam efficere." The Natura naturata, or living Kosmos, was indeed identified with the former, and nature became god. This theory of the universe has been called HYLOZOISM, and has played a conspicuous part in every age. It is really the theory of that class of modern materialists who yield to the evidence of purpose in nature, though only as IMMANENT DESIGN, which is a contradiction in thought, or a refuge from the conception of an external Designer that has no meaning. But design in any form is foreign to the strict notion of Pantheism.

3. Pure Pantheism, as an account of the existence of the universe, assumed its final and only consistent development in Christian times, and in a philosophy that has been in avowed opposition to Christianity from the beginning.

(1.) Its new foundations were laid in Neo-Platonism, an eclectic system which strove to combine all that had been taught in previous schools of philosophy concerning the relation of being to phenomena. It pronounced more boldly than it had ever been pronounced before, that one only indescribable Being exists Who reveals Himself in all things, in the soul of the world, in the universal reason, and in the spirit of man: all seemingly independent things being only transient phenomena, and all personalities being destined for reabsorption into God. While the Fathers of the Christian Church were establishing against early heresy the doctrine of the Trinity, the Second Person being the First begotten before every creature, and the Arche, or source of the creation brought into existence by the energy of the Third Person, Plotinus and Porphyry and Proclus were

establishing another trinity: the One absolute, its manifestation in the universe, and its thinking itself in universal reason. Their ideas found their best expositor in John Scotus Erigena, the idealistic Pantheist of the ninth century. His book "De Divisione Naturae " was the first manifesto of the modern system. It makes God " that which neither creates nor is created." " With God being, thought, and creating are identical" " In God it is one and the same thing to know what He makes before it is made, and to make what He knows. Therefore to know and to do is one in Him." "Man is a certain intellectual notion in the Divine mind eternally created. This is his most approved and most true definition: and it is not so only of man, but of all things which, in the Divine wisdom, were made. The entire visible and invisible creature is a Theophany: it may be called, that is, a Divine apparition." According to this conception the thought must not linger on the existence of anything apart from God; for while we think of it has changed, and of it at any moment existence cannot be predicated. The spirit of man is on the same phenomenal way to its home. The tendency of this system, as of Pantheism in every form, is to abolish sin and responsibility. But that tendency took two directions. In the one it degenerated into the worst mystical antinomianism of the Middle Ages. In the other it was counteracted by better principles; and, with strange inconsistency, the men whose theory made their soul only a spark on its way to a necessary extinction in God were absorbed in the most strenuous endeavors by perfect self-renunciation to bring themselves into a most blessed union with their Maker. But we have here to do only with theories of creation.

(2.) Spinoza, in the seventeenth century, carried the wavering dialectics of his predecessors to their legitimate conclusion. He made the principle of Descartes, that the consciousness of our existence is the first and only certainty, his starting-point. But, whereas the founder of Cartesianism argued to the real existence of a universe and a God, the founder of modern Pantheism argued in the opposite direction. He fell back upon the assured consciousness of one only substance, besides which there could be nothing. That substance may have attributes and modes; but the attributes and modes of that infinite substance, including the entire universe of mind and extension, are not reality but phenomena. Of these phenomena, including ourselves, we may predicate attributes; but not of the infinite All. According to the favorite adage of the system, which is a profound untruth, " Omnis determinatio est negatjo;" and to speak of the Infinite as being this or that, is to make Him less, or It less, than infinite. To assert that God creates or is a Creator is to deny Him His Deity: in diametrical opposition to St. Paul’s testimony that phenomenal things from the creation of the world declare His eternal power and Godhead. What in the Christian teaching—and in the Christian teaching alone—is creation, is in Pantheism an eternal and necessary evolution of the One Sum of things: everything and every person is but a mode of the existence of Being absolute; everything in its manifestation, and every person in his act, is determined by the necessity of the Divine nature, if such a term may be used at all. "Without the world no God; and no God without the world." Spinoza’s mathematically systematised Pantheism has been idealised in the philosophy of Germany, the keynote of which is that the Infinite is for ever coming to consciousness in the finite, the absolute which in itself is nothing coming to true objective existence in the creature, by an eternal movement which the thinking mind of man requires for the explanation of all being, and in which it finds rest. God is not Himself personal, but He is the sum of all personalities. This system strives to make itself Christian by terming Christ the mediator or reconciler of the Infinite and the finite in Whom God is the universe and the universe is God: the synthesis of all possible opposites.

(3.) With the endless evolutions of modern Pantheistic thought we have not to do. Suffice that it proves one thing most clearly, that the Christian doctrine of creation lies at the basis of all religion. Although the derivation of the word from Religare, to bind to, or to restrain from, be etymologically insecure, that idea is nevertheless rooted in it; and the terms Lex, or law, and Obligation are not far off. But Pantheism knows no bond between Creator and creature, because these terms are gone. Sin is no longer sin: freedom has eternally vanished from the whole economy of things. Immortality is the loss of what seemed personality, and absorption into the abyss of being, without that consciousness of absorption and rest which was the blissful dream of the best mystics, whether in the East or in the West. The universe is not the sphere in which a Creator moves, but the form in which He, by an eternal necessity, evolves Himself. The world of man cannot be the domain of Providence or redemption in which a personal God holds fellowship with His creatures. There are no creatures, nor is God He; for all the terms of personality ought to disappear, if they do not, from the system. Man is part of God’s existence —if we may return to the name God, —but God is equally part of man’s existence. There is no preeminence on His part, nor is there inferiority in His creature, if we may call man such.

Spinoza says: "Hence it follows that the human mind is part of the infinite intelligence of God: and, forsooth, when we say that the mind of man perceives this or that, we only say no more than that God, not as He is infinite but as far as He is unfolded by the nature of man, or as far as He constitutes the essence of the human mind, has this or that idea." "Accordingly in the human mind there is no absolute or free will. The mind is a sure and determined method of thinking, and therefore cannot possibly be the free cause of its own actions," The only sin the system allows is imperfection on its way to perfectness: it is the loss of that which is the only good, that is, of being. In the evolution of God there is a struggle, and the transient survival of the fittest. " By how much the more anyone can preserve his share of being the greater is the virtue with which he is endowed; conversely, so far as anyone neglects to conserve his being he is impotent." Spinoza, like many other devout Pantheists, had exalted notions of the deification of man in God as His transient representative in the process of His eternal incarnation. But at the point of his highest elevation into union with the Deity, finite man is in this system lost in the infinite. There is no Christian glorification of the creature in God, but only reabsorption into the source whence his fleeting personality came. This is pure Pantheism, creationless, and therefore without a Creator. Man has no distinct existence for ever, because he and his home, and all that is his, must be drawn back again into the ocean that other similar waves of existence may follow. Ancient Hinduism went near to this; but it may be doubted whether it ever went so far. " I am Brahm," was the language that expressed in it the highest consummation of unity with Real Being; but still the I remained. Pantheism proper has no I, either for God or for man.

SUB-PANTHEISTIC SYSTEMS.

It cannot be said that all the errors of mankind as to the created universe in its relation to the Creator may be summed up as Pantheism and Materialism. These are the extreme poles, but there are zones between of great importance in which we find the most abundant development of human speculation and practice. These can only be alluded to here, and that for two reasons: first, they do not enter into theology proper: and, secondly, they are not now predominant errors against which theology as such has to contend.

POLYTHEISM.

Holy Scripture, which is the revelation of the absolute religion, does not trace the history of man's descent from the worship of one God to the worship of gods many: nor does it shed much light upon the various forms which Polytheistic idolatry has gradually assumed. But there is nothing in the Word of God inconsistent with the following two truths: that Polytheism sprang out of a Pantheistic perversion of the feeling of mankind after one Supreme in nature and yet over nature; that it has always coexisted with a more or less indefinite sense of one Deity; and has in its best forms worked towards the absolute supremacy of the only and true God.

I. The modern Science of Religion aims to trace the development of the instinct or faculty in man for the infinite and eternal through all the records of the races: starting generally from the principle that began by investing the visible and invisible forces of nature with supernatural attributes, and then, as that religion became more dialectic, gradually emerging into Monotheism or Pantheism, in many cases drifting into Atheism by the way. Some of these teachers of Comparative Theology proceed on the theory of evolution. Taking man from the hands of the physical evolutionist, as having been slowly developed into a sentient, moral, and even religious creature, they then carry onward the principle into all the phenomena of what may be called the spiritual history of mankind.

Others take up the theory without its tremendous preliminary assumptions.

1. The testimony of Scripture is explicit here. We might infer from its early records that the successive heads of mankind, and founders of the nations, carried everywhere with them the knowledge or tradition of one Creator; and the tendency of the whole of the record supports that inference. But the New Testament, which in the fullness of time clears up the mysteries of earlier revelation, gives us a clear account of the origin of Polytheism and idolatry. St. Paul, directly dealing with this subject, speaks of the heathen as of men who hold the truth in unrighteousness. 1 He expressly says, that the created universe carried with it to the mind of man a revelation of its one Creator; that their heart was darkened and they became fools; their folly being their idolatry: they changed the glory of the incorruptible God to an image like unto corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things. 2 Here we have a kind of programme in brief of all the Polytheistic systems of antiquity. Returning from the moral corruption of the Gentiles to their idolatry, the Apostle says that they changed the truth of God for a lie, and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, Who is blessed for ever. Amen. 3

Every word here is significant. They changed, —for this was their own and their fathers act—the truth of God, the reality of the One God, or the me revelation He had given of Himself, into the Lie, the one lie of Polytheism, and worshipped in their perverted sentiments, and served in their outward idolatry, the creature besides, or above, or instead of the Creator: pará tón Ktísanta. It may be insisted on that this pará, interpreted by the context, shuts out the service of the Creator altogether; but the sacred writer would have found a more forcible way of asserting that. The essence of idolatry throughout Scripture is not the absolute exclusion of the thought of one Supreme; but the giving imaginary representatives of Him the glory due to His one name. That was the idolatry charged against the covenant people themselves; and that, in principle at least, is the idolatry of which superstitious Christendom is found guilty. It is that identification of the Creator with the creature which is the soul of Pantheism. The Holy God does not count His created universe sinful in itself; but in His holiness He is eternally separate from the creature, and will be

honored as such. Hence the Scripture warrants our introduction of this subject into the relations between God and the creature.

1 Romans 1:18; 2 Romans 1:23; 3 Romans 1:25.

2. The history of Polytheism confirms all this. Men early lost the supremacy of faith and were surrendered to sense. But the faith only lost its supremacy, and sense was not wholly sense. They never lost that within them which verified three things, let modern philosophy say what it will: the reality of their own dependent existence; the reality of an outer universe not themselves; and the reality of an Infinite Something, Being or Person, beyond that. But the distinctness of these was lost their perfect confusion was pure Pantheism; which, however, was the growth of later ages. At first, the self was distinct; but God and the creature were blended. The One Being was everywhere felt and seen, but not as one being: His energies were distributed, and Naturism, or nature-worship, was the result: the term worship being here conventionally used. The two extremes lie before us in the history of mankind. There is Fetichism, a term invented in the last century to describe the abject superstition which attaches to an endless variety of objects a mysterious connection with supernatural powers, making them symbols of spiritual influences haunting all nature. This takes its most grotesque form in Western Africa, but has pervaded all ages and races, from the Teraphim of Mesopotamia to the Shamanism of Tartary. At the opposite pole is the dread magnificence of the Oriental Greek and Scandinavian Mythologies, where Fetichism is expanded, etherealised, and developed into its grandest proportions. But everywhere, and in all its forms, it is the idolatry of the creature which loses the Creator: in multiplicity forgetting the unity, though the unity was never far off. From that mankind had wandered, and to that must they, after long wanderings, return.

II. The history of the religious beliefs of mankind bears witness that there never was a national or tribal Polytheism which did not, more or less, consciously give the supremacy to one, and only one being.

1. The most wonderful, certainly the earliest system of mythology—if such a name may be allowed—is that of the primitive Aryans, whose strong religious feeling deified all the forces of nature. Every object in which they felt the presence of the invisible and the infinite was raised into something supernatural, into a Deva, bright being; Asura, a living thing; and Amartya, an immortal. By degrees, the multitude of gods approximated to a deification of universal nature; but by degrees also the strong tendency of the Indian religion was to find its refuge in a kind of Atheism which was really a protest in favor of one God, or in aspirations after one God by name.

(1.) As the Aryan theology is the grandest outside of the Bible—how entirely outside of it we shall see—a few illustrations may be derived from it of the principle we are considering, that the One Creator has been always unconsciously groped for in every system. In the Indian religion we may see in epitome, though in a vast epitome, the entire evolution: so absolutely the entire evolution, that it may be selected to represent the whole. We cannot determine what thought concerning the Supreme was behind the earliest Vedic worship; it may have been that the early hymns to Aditi, the boundless or the infinite One, were remembrances of a primitive Monotheistic religion. But certainly in process of ages the whole tide of Hondo thought and feeling set in towards One Highest God, in the noblest, if not the most beautiful, monarchical form of Polytheism. The supreme sway of the Unknown God, however, was of no avail, so long as He had crowds of

representatives nearer than He, The time of reformation came: but it led: to a philosophical Atheism, or to Buddhism and Pantheism. The only religion that India never knew until Christianity brought it near is Monotheism. To that there has always, however, been a steady tendency; though, neither in India, nor in any part of the world, will Polytheism give place to the worship of one God until that God is accepted in the Holy Trinity.

(2.) Professor Max Muller has invented a new word to express a certain peculiarity, as he deems it, in the evolution of Indian thought concerning God: his own description will be given, especially as it is almost applicable to all the more enlightened nations of heathenism. " If we must have a general name for the earliest form of religion among the Vedic Indians, it can be neither Monotheism, nor Polytheism, but only Henotheism, that is, a belief and worship of those single objects, whether semi-tangible or intangible, in which man first suspected the presence of the invisible and the infinite, each of which as we saw was raised into something more than finite, more than natural, more than conceivable." . . . "This is the peculiar character of the ancient Vedic religion which I have tried to characterize as HENOTHEISM or KATHENOTHEISM, a successive belief in single supreme gods, in order to keep it distinct from that phase of religious thought which we commonly call Polytheism, in which the many gods are already subordinated to one supreme God, and by which therefore the craving after the one without a second has been more fully satisfied. In the Veda one god after another is invoked. For the time being all that can be said of a divine being is ascribed to him. The poet, while addressing him, seems scarcely to know of any other gods. But in the same collection of hymns, sometimes even in the same hymn, other gods are mentioned, and they also are truly divine, truly independent, or, it may be, supreme. . . . But what interests us at present is how that intention was realized; by how many steps, by how many names, the infinite was grasped, the unknown named, and at last the Divine reached. Those beings who are called DEVAS in the Veda are in many places not yet even the same as the Greek theos; for the Greeks, even so early as the time of Homer, had begun to suspect that, whatever the number and nature of the so-called gods might be, there must be something supreme, whether a god or a fate, there must be at least ONE Father of gods and men. In some portions of the Veda, too, the same idea breaks through, and we imagine that as in Greece, Italy, Germany, and elsewhere, so in India also, the religious craving after the one would have been satisfied by a monarchical Polytheism. But the Indian mind soon went, and we shall see how in the end it was driven, to a denial of all the devas or gods, and a search for something higher than all the devas, Dyaus himself, or Varuna, or Indra, or Pragapati not excluded . . . The process which we have been watching in the case of the sun, we can watch, again and again, with regard to most of the Vedic deities. Not, however, with regard to all. The so-called semi-deities, the rivers, the mountains, the clouds, the sea, others also, such as the dawn, the night, the wind, or the storm, never rise to the rank of supreme deity; but of Agni, the fire, of Varuna, the covering sky, of Indra, Vishnu, Rudra, Soma, Pargaanya, and others, epithets are used, and whole descriptions given, which, to our mind, would be appropriate to a supreme Deity only."

(3.) There was another stage of development. " First of all, we find that several of these single deities, having sprung from one and the same source, have a tendency, after a very short career of their own, to run together. Dyaus was the sky as the ever-present tight Varuna was the sky as the all-embracing. Mitra was the sky as lighted up by the sun of the morning. Surya was the sun as shining in the sky. Savitri was the sun as bringing light and life. Vishnu was the sun as striding with

three steps across the sky; Indra appeared in the sky as the giver of rain; Rudra and the Maruts passed along the sky in thunderstorms; Vata and Vayu were the winds of the air; Agni was fire and light, wherever it could be perceived, whether as rising out of darkness in the morning, or sinking in the darkness in the evening. The same applies to several of the minor deities. Hence it constantly happened that what was told of one deity could be told of another likewise; the same epithets are shared by many, the same stories are told of different gods." " Another expedient adopted by the ancient poets, and which seems quite peculiar to the Yeda, is the formation of dual deities" " A third expedient was to comprehend all the gods by one common name, to call them VISVE DEVAS, the all-gods, and to address prayers and sacrifices to them in their collective capacity." (4.) " Lastly, there was that other expedient, which to us seems the most natural of all, in order to bring the craving for one god into harmony with the existence of many gods, viz. the expedient, adopted by the Greeks and Romans, of making one of the gods supreme above all the rest: thus satisfying the desire for a supreme power, the eis koiranos esto, and not breaking entirely with the traditions of the past, and the worship paid to individual manifestations of the divine in nature, such as were Apollon and Athena, or Poseidon and Hades, by the side of Zeus." . . . Here we have an almost universal phenomenon, and one that pays a deep homage to the truth of the Scriptures, and the revelation of the one only Creator: the peculiarity of the homage being that every such unconscious homage to the one Supreme was paid to Him as the Originator of all things.

There was among the Vedic Aryans the same tendency to establish supremacy among the gods, a one Creating God, as we find in the mythologies not only of Greece and of Rome, but of Germany and Scandinavia. "There are a few hymns addressed to Visvakarman, the creator, and Pragapati, the lord, in which there are but small traces left of the solar germ from whence they sprang. Some of them remind us of the language of the Psalms; and one imagines that a deity such as Pragapati or Visvakarman would really have satisfied the monotheistic yearnings, and constituted the last goal in the growth of the religious sentiment of the ancient Aryans of Indra. But this, as we shall see, was not to be." This was not to be; because men having lost their faith in the one supreme Creator could not return to Him until they were taught to abandon their false gods, forsake their Pantheon, and give back to the True God the glory due to His name. Meanwhile, in evidence that Polytheism has always struggled unconsciously towards the truth, we may quote the Vedic hymn referred to: "He the One God, whose eyes are everywhere, whose mouth, whose arms, whose feet are everywhere; he, when producing heaven and earth, forges them together with his arms and with the wings." " Beyond the sky, beyond the earth, beyond the Devas and the Asuras, what was the first germ which the waters bore, wherein all gods were seen?" "You will never know him who created these things; something else stands between you and him. Enveloped in mist, and with faltering voice, the poets walk along rejoicing in life." There are a few such tributes to the creator dispersed in the Rig-Veda, which, notwithstanding that they are addressed to different beings, are proofs that the true God never left Himself without a witness. To quote Max Muller once more: " With such ideas as these springing up in the minds of the Vedic poets, we should have thought that the natural development of their old religion would have been towards Monotheism, towards the worship of one personal God, and that thus in Indra also the highest form would have been reached which man feels inclined to give to the Infinite, after all other forms and names have failed." 2. These extracts have been given as illustrating the most interesting and affecting phenomenon in the history of the race: its struggles to return from its wanderings to God.

On a smaller scale the same evolution has been going on, and, alas, is still going on, throughout the earth. And the science which makes this history the basis of some great generalizations is called the Science of Religion or Comparative Theology. The study is of great importance, and yields great advantage to the Christian Cause, though it is generally prosecuted in a spirit of opposition to the exclusive claims of Christianity.

(1.) It brings boundless evidence from every corner of the earth and from every tribe of humanity that it is of the very nature of man to inquire after the Creator of the world he lives in. The entire sphere of sensible objects around him, and of perceptible forces above him, have been deified only in the service of a higher and nobler desire to penetrate through all these to the One beyond: appealing to Him always as Creator, or at least thinking of Him and addressing Him as the Author and Disposer of all things. As the ancient Vedic poets perpetually uttered their protests against the Devic idolatry, so all the bards and prophets of every religion have shown their sense of something behind the crowded sphere of their lower divinities. Either as the Great Spirit of the far West, or the Aditi, the Infinite, of the far East or the Moira, Destiny, of the Greeks, or the Jupiter Optimus Maximus of the Romans, there is in every religion or mythology some name that stands as a symbol of the One Supreme as yet unknown. There are thought to be a few exceptions: in the early religion of the Chinese and of the Germans it may be hard to trace these tendencies to Monotheism. But this is mainly because the archives are wanting to complete the evidence. And certain it is that the process of time and of reformation has brought out the latent tendency. This last point is of importance: almost every ancient form of religion has had its eras of reform; and most of those reforms have been Monotheistic in the long run if not immediately so. China might seem to deny this; it was in the earliest ages more Pantheistic than any other nation, and, after receiving the reformation of Confucius, fell under the influence of Buddhism. But through all Chinese philosophy there runs the idea of the Primitive Force, Yang, and primitive matter, Ju.Ischuhi in due time rose above this dualism and regarded these as the two faces of one sole primitive being, Tai-Ky. This seems pure Pantheism; but Pantheism, whether in East or West, has been the refuge of the minds of men from many gods in one Eternal Self of the universe, its one Cause if not its Creator.

(2.) The study tends greatly to serve the cause of the Christian religion by showing the incomparable superiority of the records of revelation. The Bible is the sole book of the so-called sacred books of the world which contains one, and one only, and one consistent account of the origin of all things. The difference between that account and every other extant in literature is not simply one of degree: the degree cannot be estimated. In every other document, even the noblest fragments of the Veda not excepted, the hints are obscure and inconsistent, the tributes are paid to different beings, or to the same being under different names, and sometimes there are most incongruous associations introduced. But in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments there is one most heavenly hymn to the Creator which has no single discordant note from the first verse of Genesis In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth 1 down to the last hymn of revelation: Thou art worthy, 0 Lord, to receive glory and honor and power; for Thou hast created all things, and for Thy pleasure they were and were created. 2 1 Genesis 1:1; 2 Revelation 4:11.

DUALISM. This generic word embraces all those systems of antiquity which strove to explain the contradictions manifest in the universe by tracing all things up to two irreconcilable principles; In respect to creation, it assigned to matter in some form an eternal independent existence, or, if not

an existence independent, at least an existence as necessary to human thought as that of the Eternal Energy that moulds it. This is its differential element in relation to Pantheism. The one says that God is in all things, or that all things are God; the other says that God MOVES in all-things, either as their soul in their harmony or as their controller in their discords. Hence the distinction is a sound one that has termed Pantheism MONISM, and the system we now consider DUALISM. But we have many subdivisions of Dualism.

1. There is a sense in which the notion of a perpetual conflict pervaded all the religious ideas of antiquity. The sovereignty of one God not being firmly held, there was no settled theory either as to creation or as to the supremacy of one Being in the midst of its disharmonies. Even in the best philosophies the world was the theatre of a mysterious struggle between light and darkness, good and evil, and the step was easy from this to a contest between powers above visible nature, and the evil that was manifest in nature itself. Running through all species of ancient Pantheism and Polytheism there is a stream of Dualism that cannot be hid, There is hardly a form of ancient mythology which did not, more or less distinctly, set over against each other two opposite forces, and distribute its higher powers accordingly; though sometimes introducing a mysterious synthesis of the two by a profound instinct of the truth. We may go farther, and say that this idea unconsciously plays its part in almost every system of thought, Pantheistic or Polytheistic, in ancient and modern times.

2. The most remarkable expression of the principle, in itself the most elaborate and in its influences the most lasting, was that of Zoroaster, the reformer of Persian Dualism.

Before his time Iranian religion was Polytheistic, with a tendency to divide all spiritual powers into two conflicting orders, good and evil; his reform, about twelve hundred years B.C., aimed to bring back a more Monotheistic view, by making both Ormuzd and Ahriman spring from a higher existence, Zeruane Akerene, the infinite and timeless existence, and by teaching the future annihilation of evil. But, whatever the secret philosophy of this Persian religion might be, its open teaching and practical developments were Dualistic. How far its principles touched the question of the eternity of matter has been much questioned: probably that part of the system was derived rather from Buddhistic and Grecian speculation.

3. Certainly the Dualism which we meet with in the Gnostic heresies of the early Christian ages was not more nearly related to Zoroastrianism than to the later speculations of Greek philosophy. From the former it derived the idea of an eternal opposition of light and darkness; and of the Divine operation conceived as the emanation of rays or aeons of existence decreasing in intensity until they reach the darkness of matter, where all evil is. From the latter it derived its philosophical idea of matter, as a certain indeterminate and undefinable principle, existent, and yet not existing, having in it the possibility of all things, not personal, without intelligence, and the material out of which phenomena are woven. The creation in the Gnostic systems was not the work of the Eternal God. Nor was it eternal in any sense, save as spiritual existences for ever flow from the source of light. As matter it was already eternal, in the shape of the kenoma, or empty void, outside of the plhroma, constituting the perfect revelation of the God of true existence. The bridge between the Abyss or buthos of substantial being and the material visible world was the fall of the last of the emanations into matter, and producing the Demiurgus (or Earth-former), or soul of the world. The infinite varieties of the Gnostic systems were efforts to account for the contact between the Eternal

Spirit and matter, the seal of all darkness and source of all evil. The result was a Creator, who, first conceived of as unconsciously carrying out the Divine purposes, is at last made the diametrical opposite of God. The history of Gnosticism, in which the Dualist idea sought to Christianize itself, but in. vain, which the Christian Church cast out, stage after stage, until its final overthrow as Manichaeism, is worthy of profound study. But a few remarks in relation to our present subject are all that is necessary here.

(1.) The whole system was a vast and bewildering attempt to bridge over the impassable gulf between the Infinite and the finite. It was one contribution towards solving a problem that has taxed the human mind and baffled it from the beginning. Starting from a principle, the origin of which no man knows, that matter is inherently evil, the question was to account for its existence without disparaging the Supreme. It was assumed that the Eternal Being permitted an aeon from Himself to transgress the oros, or boundary of His own essence, and produce from matter, either by creating it, as some said, or quickening it as others, all creaturely existence. In human souls good and evil elements were mixed; and to undo the work of the Demiurge or creator of this confusion was the work of redemption. The task of the Christ, a new aeon sent forth to assume the docetic semblance of matter, was to bring back the stray emanations that had become imprisoned in the world, to release man therefore from the body, his resurrection being "past already," and either to annihilate matter absolutely or to leave it to its empty chaos. The wildness of these systems was only equaled by their inconsistency. They left the impassable oros where they found it. They sought to trace what, in modern times, would be called the law of continuity from the creation upwards to the Deity, or from the Creator downwards to the creation. And they thought they found it in the gradual attenuation of the light emanations until they passed over the boundary, and mixed with the darkness of matter beyond. But they were for ever vexed by two great anomalies.

First, the Divine Pleroma was supposed to give out aeons urged by love and desire which degraded the eternal essence down to the point of lusting after the material void. And, secondly, they either regarded that material void as eternally existing, or they supposed that the Supreme permitted the Demiurge to create it as the element of all future evil.

(2.) The sublime doctrine of the relation of the Eternal Son to the creature is the only secret of the continuity which is taught, the only bridge between the Creator and the creature. He is the Mediator—if such a use of the term may be allowed—between the Infinite and the finite, between God and the creature. With their eyes on the rising Gnosticism that was to disturb the Church St. Paul and St. John often use expressions which cannot be well understood but as laying down the truth concerning the Son, as the Archeegón teés Zooeés and the Archee tees ktiseos, 1 which the dualistic heretics perverted. St John taught that God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all; 2 but he also taught that Jesus, as the true Light which enlighteneth every man, was coming into the world, 3 not, however, as an aeon or emanation; for in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. 4 Every word of this last sentence of St. Paul contradicts the Gnostic speculations as to the Demiurgus: the entire pleérooma of the Godhead, and not an emanation, dwelt in Him and did not descend upon Him bodily, and not in semblance. And He Who was the First begotten before every creature, 5 was such as the Archee or Beginning, in Whom and through Whom creation began. By Him were all things created: as if in Him the Absolute God, or the Father, originated the creaturely existence, upholds it and administers it; by an incarnation

before the Incarnation. We cannot conceive how the creaturely universe should have this specific relation to the Son, and how in Him the Infinite became-finite, before God became flesh; but we must receive the mystery and adore it. Our Lord was the Firstborn of the new creation when He began its life in Himself; and He is the First begotten, or the Beginning of the creation of God, which had its origin in Him.

1 Acts 3:15; 2 1 John 1:5; 3 John 1:9; 4 Colossians 2:9; 5 Colossians 1:15-20.

MATERIALISTIC ATHEISM. At the opposite pole of Pantheism stands Materialism as the philosophical or scientific antagonist of the Scriptural doctrine of the Creator and creation: opposite poles, however, of one and the same sphere of thought. Pantheism gives the notion of God the preeminence, all things phenomenal being His eternal but ever-changing vesture; Materialism gives matter the pre-eminence, as the only substance that is, and regards what men call God as the unknown law by which that substance is governed in all its evolutions. Strictly speaking, Materialism proper has no place here. It is simply a question of science and scientific speculation; being, as touching the created universe, a pure negative, that can neither prove itself nor disprove anything else.

COMMON PRINCIPLES.

Certain fundamental principles are common to the Materialism of all ages. Denying the distinction of matter and spirit it denies the existence of spirit altogether; and soul or spirit, being only one particular form of the existence or function of matter, is immortal only in the sense that matter is indestructible and in some form or other will for ever go on producing the same phenomena. Religion has no place in this system. It makes that the strange fantasy which it is the unaccountable habit of the brain of man almost universally to beget: all its hopes and fears and aspirations perish with the organism that gave them birth. Discarding religion, it nevertheless has always prided itself on being a philosophy. As such, it must of necessity investigate the origin of things. One of the eccentricities of what we call thought is that matter must seek to know its own beginning, and the reason of its existence. Its futile speculations perish, like its religion, with every individual thinker’s brain; yet, like its religion, these are transmitted from age to age. But its questions are never answered. Thinking matter can only say of itself that it must always have existed since it now exists; that it knows nothing about any power that could have brought it into being; that it has no explanation whatever of the difference between itself as inanimate, and itself as endowed with life; and, in short, that it can only say, unconsciously echoing the eternal truth which it will not receive, " I am that I am." If it is not its own creator it at least will know of no other. But the very word creation is abhorrent to the system from beginning to end.

HISTORY OF MATERIALISM.

These fundamental principles, however, have been variously molded, from generation to generation. There is a history of Materialism as there is a history of Pantheism and Dualism. With that theology has nothing directly to do, but it may be of indirect advantage to indicate the lines of development as they have been directed consciously or unconsciously by opposition to revealed truth. All the principles of Materialism were laid down by ancient heathenism; they have been asserted in direct opposition to Christianity as a revelation of God; and, lastly, they are now sought to be established in the interests of pure science, which answers every Christian suggestion by

either perfect indifference or an appeal to universal nescience. A few words on each of these points in its order.

ANTIQUITY. The Materialism of ancient times was atheistic; and, as such, in professed antagonism to the predominant schools of thought, Eastern and Western. Epicurus, an Athenian philosopher of the fourth century before Christ, is sometimes regarded as its founder. . From the remains handed down to us we gather that his system contained most of the ideas which rule modern thought on this question. He set out with the principle which Lucretius, his disciple, has thus formulated: Ex nihilo nihil, in nihilum nil posse reverti. The universe he regarded as infinite: infinite in the number of bodies, infinite in the space that holds them. The elements of which all bodies are constituted are indivisible, atom, and unchangeable, ametablhtoa. These atoms, endowed from eternity with movement which makes them meet, combine into aggregates, whether smaller or larger as in the celestial spaces. As to this world, to pan esti soma. What we know we know through our senses; and when the organs perish the functions perish. Epicurus entirely dismissed the idea of Providence. If he admitted the existence of gods, it was only in the interest of prudence, the one criterion of his morals. " All is false that is commonly said about the gods: there is no truth in the chastisements they are supposed to inflict on men, nor in the rewards they assign to the good." " There are gods, and the knowledge we have of them is certain; but they are not what the vulgar suppose. The impious man is not he who refuses to believe in the gods of the common people, but he who accepts them as they do." His was an Atheism disguised, as Cicero says: " Video nonnullis videri Epicurum, ne in offensionem Atheniensium caderet, verbis reliquisse deos, re sustulisse." Thus Epicurus gathered up the fragments of Leucippus and Democritus, and gave them through Lucretius a form ready for future science. And, as his physical system anticipated much that modern times have more fully formulated, so his moral system was a favorable sketch of the highest ethics of Materialism. With him virtue is only the means, the prudential means, to the end of peace and tranquility. While Plato sought the sovereign good in resemblance to God, and Zeno in conformity with universal law, Epicurus went no farther than the attainment of as near an approach as possible to the tranquil rest of nature, and the utmost enjoyment of life.

Let us eat and drink, far to-morrow we die, 1 is St. Paul’s account of the ethics down to which this system surely descends or gravitates by its own inherent tendency.

1 1 Corinthians 15:32.

ATHEISM OR ANTITHEISM. When we speak of Atheism proper, we speak of a phase of the controversy touching a great First Cause of creation, which has, for reasons hereafter to be given, almost passed away. The word is not in favor; it is renounced even by those whose reasoning naturally lead to it; let other terms be used and they have no objection to a disguised god, either nameless or with the name they prefer; but Atheism they reject as unphilosophical. But, before reaching this more modern phase of the scientific Materialistic form of it, we must make some remarks on Atheism proper, which has aimed to rid the creation of a Creator and of a God.

1. The question may be fairly asked, is blank Atheism or Antitheism possible to the human mind? And the answer must be finally given that it is not. The appeal may be made to Scripture: an appeal which ought to be allowed, whether for the conclusion of all strife or not, since it is undeniable that the Bible contains the largest and noblest collection of the world’s religious

thoughts. Throughout the whole of this book, which gives its testimony to the whole variety of human error, there is no single allusion to men from whose minds the thought of God is erased. The book demonstrates everything about the Deity but His existence: it never descends to argue with an Atheist, for it never supposes that it speaks to such a man. Besides the wicked who say onto God, Depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of Thy ways, 1 it singles out the fool who hath said in his heart, there is no God; 2 but these are evidently, as the context proves, the same persons. The theoretical Atheist is not in the Bible. Nor will a believer in revelation allow that he exists in the world at large. Wherever the word of revelation is sent its mission is to proclaim, not the existence of God, but the sin of man, the need of a Deliverer, and a Deliverer provided. All nations are supposed to require only that the Unknown God, Whom they ignorantly worship, be declared unto them. And in every part of the world that faculty to receive the supernatural has been found, which is, if not the belief in God, yet at least the denial of Atheism. The appeal must be made to fact and the testimony of history, past and present: " What people is there 1 said Cicero, " or what race of men, which has not, without traditional teaching, some presentiment of the existence of gods?" That nations may have been found in the past, and tribes of savages now, which have no clear notion of one Supreme Being, and no worship of any kind, may be admitted. But the very lowest waifs and strays of humanity have always manifested the existence of that hidden mystery of its origin which owns affinity with the supernatural. And that is all our present argument requires.

1 Job 21:14; 2 Psalms 53:1.

2. Atheism proper, as distinguished from other forms of the error that goes astray from God, has mostly sprung from moral causes, and denotes therefore a system of thought which the healthiest instinct of mankind has always abhorred. The early history of our race bears witness that the Atheist was counted unworthy of any respect. The denial of the existence of the gods was proscribed and punished. Even those systems of thought which tended to the removal of faith were careful to disguise their attack on the gods.

Epicurus in words acknowledged their possible existence. After the appearance of our Lord professed atheism was very rare, until the general corruption of society in the last century. And, in fact, the term in theology is reserved for a state of feeling produced by many diversified moral causes, which culminated in the excesses of the French Revolution.

3. Since that time Atheism has been scientific, philosophical, and generally disguised under the name of AGNOSTICISM: certainly the most refined of all its forms, and that which most directly mocks and insults the dignity of human nature. It shrinks from avowed Atheism; and will not dare to say there is no God. It shrinks from Materialism, and will not dare to say that the forces of matter account for all phenomena. It simply declares the impossibility of knowing what the tremendous FORCE is that controls all things. There is no more deadly form of the great error of mankind than this which undermines every foundation.

4. There may be said to be a modern ANTI-THEISM, that is not content with throwing off the fetters of a Deity, but must needs argue against the possibility of the existence of such a God as the Scriptures present. Atheism is content with the privative particle, Antitheism is active and aggressive. There is, however, a restraint upon the minds of men, and a decency in society, which forbid the explosion of this kind of sentiment. When it does appear it is at best, or at worst, little

other than a modern Manichaeism or Dualism. The existence of God is not blankly denied; but the evil that exists is made an argument that, if a God is, He must be limited in many respects, and not by any means the Being Whom we reverence and adore. There is much latent Manichseism in society and in literature; many fall back upon two deities who are hardly conscious of doing so. However, the God Whom the Scriptures reveal must be accepted as He is, even though He says, I form the light and create darkness.1 1 Isaiah 14:6-7.

SCIENTIFIC MATERIALISM.

If what has been said is true, then Materialism, makes matter its god. There must be absolute existence: matter is eternal, self-sufficient, infinite, necessary, and the only being. Scientific Materialism, strictly so called, is based upon two principles which it sometimes postulates, though unreasonably, and sometimes seeks to prove, but unsuccessfully. One of them is negative, that there is nothing but matter in existence; and the other is positive, that matter in its combinations and modes of evolution is an adequate cause of all phenomena. It may be objected that this is inverting the order of materialistic argument, which first proves that nothing but the laws of matter are needed to give a reason for all that exists, and then by the principle of the "sufficient reason " renounces all other existence. Yielding to this objection, though denying its truth, let us glance at the principles of the positive argument, and then at the negative conclusion: abstaining, however, from scientific controversy, which is generally not within our compass.

1. We need only mention two necessary demonstrations at which Materialism aims, in which, however, it signally fails: the correlation of physical and vital forces, and the correlation of these with mental and what we call spiritual forces. Here are the stumblingblocks of Materialism, over which it has hitherto fallen, and must for ever fall. Until these are established this system has no claim to be considered as based on inductive science. For simplification, we may drop the last link, that of the mental forces; and then the question becomes this: Is life one mode of the motion of that force which is supposed to be one, persistent and indestructible in the universe of material atoms? Scientific Materialism has at length, though not without diffidence and many haltings, come to the conclusion that it is so. Taking the material sun for its god— for every theory, like every man, must have a god—it finds in it the original force, potential everywhere and kinetic everywhere, of every movement in the sum of human things. Of the power beyond that made the sun what it is—the god behind the god— it has nothing to say. Now, so long as this law is limited to physical changes, it may be accepted: it has to fight its own battle. But when it carries the law into the sphere of life, it not only denies the truth of Scripture, but ceases to have even that measure of probability which the theory of the interchangeableness of physical forces has. For a considerable time the argument from analogy was relied on. It was thought unphilosophic to stop short, after having discovered the one secret up to the limits of vital force: at any rate, the temptation was very strong to include the forces of life and thought under the one law. But the phenomena rebelled. It has been found utterly impossible to carry it into this other region. Life and thought have never submitted to measurement and quantification. Dead matter has never been changed into living. It is idle to speak of the correlation of physical and living or mental force, until the latter can be measured by the same standard as the former. The entrance of life into the sphere of matter is the annihilation of Materialism. It cannot explain that secret whereby something in the individual appropriates dead matter, suitable to its own type of existence. Materialists themselves acknowledge that this secret is hid from them; and vainly disguise their impotence by

adopting such terms as " directive agency," or " architectonic principle/' or " formative impulse." Whence comes this principle of eternal difference between dead and living matter? Though denying it in words, Materialism touches, nevertheless, in reality the interaction of another set of forces besides those which reign in physics. This it will be driven finally to acknowledge. Materialists have done service by fixing attention upon the deep truth that there is a correlation between these forces; a most mysterious and wonderful interaction between the phenomena of physical and spiritual life. Well for them if they would learn, on their side, to distinguish things that differ.

2. Meanwhile, the system is chargeable with the utmost possible outrage upon the rational convictions of mankind. It is essentially atheistic in its tendency, if all who espouse these principles are not Atheists. There is a large number of those who bind up with matter and molecular action all kinds of life and thought while they admit the possibility of an inscrutable force behind or above all this; but they either deny the possibility of knowing anything about this unknown power, or they absolutely limit it to a force which has no operation save through matter. It may be safely affirmed that those who adopt the leading principles of Materialism either are or soon become Atheists. And, renouncing God, everything that confers dignity on man or worthiness on life is gone. The system denies the existence of anything beyond matter: it takes away from man his spirit, his immortality, his all. It ought to deny him the consciousness of personal identity; its principles lead that way; for if man is only material, and the particles of his physical self are every moment changing, and undergo a total change in the course of a few years, what can be the substratum of his identity? It dares not take that away; but it takes away all that makes it important Materialism is the most irrational error that ever misled the human mind; and to the holder of it, if to any, applies the Apostle's apostrophe, áfroon!1 Yet we have now to see this made into a philosophy.

1 1 Corinthians 15:36.

POSITIVISM.

Positivism has been dignified by the name of a philosophy. Its founder, Auguste Comte, was a legacy of the eighteenth century to the nineteenth, and of French Encyclopsedism and St. Simonianism to modern science. The result of his labors is a philosophy of the physical sciences which is almost entirely limited to induction, renouncing all thought of the causes of things, tracing simply the sequences of nature, and so ascertaining its laws, with a professed rejection of everything that is merely speculative or probable, and stern limitation of knowledge to what can be demonstrated beyond doubt, and is therefore Positive. To construct such a philosophy certain fundamental principles were adopted, which, however, are far from being positively determined: such as that nothing exists of which our senses do not assure us; that there is nothing existent but matter; that all phenomena are subject to invariable laws which it is the business of science to register, and only to register; that these laws are simply relations of succession and resemblance; that in the cerebral phenomena of mind they are as absolutely physical in their necessary sequence as any other observed phenomena, only that they require greater care in observation; and that the highest aim of science should be to forecast by scientific prevision the certain future of human actions, just as the courses of the planets may be predicted. Hence the Positive Philosophy, interpreting the possible future by the past, and the necessary laws of human action which it has discovered, exults in the ambition to reduce the infinite complications of human

freewill and congregated action to the exactness of a physical science. " I will venture to say that sociological science, though only established by this book, already rivals mathematical science itself, not in precision and fecundity, but in positivity and rationality." This assertion of Comte was not empty declamation. Both he and his followers have surveyed the history of the world on this principle, and are full of confidence that by mastering the laws of human action they will provide the ordained rulers of the world's social fabric. But Sociology is never far from Religion; and the Positive Philosophy is no exception to the universal rule that every system of thought that commands human attention must deserve it by at least attempting to account for the principles that men call their faith. What then is the relation of this philosophy to Religion? 1. First, Positivism has its method of accounting for the religions that now are, before it substitutes its own. It sets out with the broad generalization that the human race passes through three stages of intellectual evolution. First comes that in which the supernatural haunts the thought, seeking for causes of things, and inventing a Deity with all His court to account for them: this theological stage works itself slowly upwards from abject superstition, such as Fetichism, through the Polytheistic and Pantheistic ' systems, up to Christianity. Secondly comes the Metaphysical stage, in effect only a modification of the first: that in which the ideas of abstract forces, or occult powers, are introduced to account for the phenomena of the universe by those who have rejected the idea of a Creator. Thirdly and lastly, comes the Positive stage, in which the mind, ashamed of its superstitions, and wearied of its ontological researches, limits itself to the arrangement of phenomena When this generalization is examined it explodes immediately. It is not true historically; nor has it any right to govern a philosophy of history. It is undoubtedly correct as an explanation of the career of many individual minds, which have passed through the phases of simple faith in God, and metaphysical, pantheistic, or dualistic subtitles that have been substituted for it, ending in a dreary determination to accept only what is, and to leave the rest to nescience. The celebrated "three stages" have not the slightest value, save as registering the progress of faith through skepticism to unbelief.

2. The Positive Philosophy has its religion. For, in its fidelity to the observation and record of positive facts, it finds nothing more positive than the universal aspiration of mankind towards the unseen and the all but universal practice of some kind of worship.

Now these facts must not be accounted for theologically or metaphysically: that is to say, there must be no God; nor must any force, making for what it may, be substituted. It is a positive fact which must be dealt with philosophically and socially. But, looked at in either light, the Positivist way of treating man's religion is a gigantic inconsistency.

(1.) This last development of the scientific spirit refuses to carry the inductive principle into the region of the mental and emotional and active phenomena of mankind. It observes and notes these things; but with the foregone conclusion that they are the result of a certain combination of material atoms, and development of these forces not yet perfectly accounted for. Forced by its hypothesis to exclude all metaphysical or occult causes on the one hand, and swayed, on the other hand, by the despotism of the desire to find the unity of all things, it notes and registers all the mental and spiritual phenomena of mankind, the thoughts that penetrate the lowest depths, and the aspirations that shrink not from the highest heights, as so many new facts concerning matter. Now here is the deep inconsistency of the whole system. The innumerable phenomena of thought, feeling, and will are as much facts as gravitation, cohesion, and molecular motion. The same consciousness guarantees both: the one as referring to the self, and the other as belonging

to not-self. The testimony of conscience asserts that the continuity is broken between these; that they go together up to a certain point, and then separate; not taking two paths, however, for there is an illimitable gulf between. The world of concepts, imaginations, feelings, and emotions, absolutely unallied with matter, is a real world, and ought to be dealt with as such. Positivism shuts its eyes to the positive fact that this ideal world governs the other material world, and is not governed by it.

(2.) Socially, Positivism uses, or would use, the religious instincts—by whatever name known—of mankind for the good of the body corporate. It must have its objective creed; and the only positive thing to believe in, venerate, and worship is Humanity: " The Great Collective Life of which human beings are the individuals. It must be conceived as having an existence apart from human beings, just as we conceive each human being to have an existence apart from, though dependent on, the individual cells of which his organism is composed. This Collective Life is, in Comte's system, the Etre Supreme; the only one we can know, therefore the only one we can worship." This being the first article of the New Creed, its last, as the substitute for Resurrection and Immortality, is " Living in the remembrance" of survivors. Here, it must strike everyone, is another proof of a fact that has forced itself upon us everywhere, that no system is without its god: the human mind can no more think without that condition than without the conditions of time and space. Positivism must have its something beyond, and above, and surviving its material nature. What is its abstract humanity but the creature worshipped para ton Ktisanta, instead of the Creator?

SECONDARY CREATION, OR COSMOGONY. The Wisdom of God, accompanying His Power, presides over Creation as secondary, that is, as Formation. It is necessary to establish a distinction between the first production of matter and its subsequent elaboration, if such a term may be used, into the Cosmos, which brings us into the region of Cosmogony or Cosmology. It is important to consider whether the terms used by the inspired writer permit the distinction. Generally, it may be said that asah kara and to in the Hebrew, are used interchangeably for both, answering to ktizo in the Greek, and that they do not distinguish between the first creation and the second each being equally the act of omnipotence. But the double expression Created and Made 1 seems significantly to indicate a distinction which is not clearly defined; and a careful examination of later passages in which they are used together or separately will confirm this supposition. It must be remembered, however, that this secondary creation, or continuous formation, is in the truest sense production into being, as the infusion into the primitive matter of new forms and types of life, from the lowest trace of it scarcely discernible by science up to the soul of man. Hence the gradual construction of which the Scriptural Cosmogony speaks at length is in reality creation proper to us.

1 Genesis 2:3 THE MOSAIC COSMOGONY. The authoritative account of Creation found in Genesis is not, of course, what in modern language would be called scientific. It is given in the form of an express revelation from God Himself, before man or his science existed; given as the basis of all subsequent revelation to Israel, for the Hebrew observance of the Sabbath is essentially bound up with it; but given also for all mankind, the Genesis out of which all human history sprang.

Receiving it as such, we have first to consider its own teaching: its relation to other systems is a subordinate matter, but must be looked at also in its place.

1. It is important to remember that it furnishes an account of all creation, whether primary or secondary; but with special reference to the latter, in the preparation of the earth for the history of man and redemption. Strictly speaking, there is no distinction between these; the six days' work, we are told subsequently, included the universe: In six days the Lord made heaven and the earth. 1 However the days are interpreted they embrace the sum of things. What basis of truth there is in the general theory of evolution, which, as working in the great cosmical forces of inanimate nature, takes the form or many forms of the Nebula Hypothesis, and, as working in animated nature, takes the form or many forms of Development, must be made consistent with this doctrine of creation. But the Scriptural Cosmogony makes the will of God, expressed in fact, first the origin of all things, and then the Law behind these other laws. Before our Biblical Chaos and above it and around it there was a steadfast and tranquil cosmical system, the result of secondary creation acting through the natural laws which it fixed: it was only the earth that was without form and void. 2 And the six days of our account exhibit this truth with special reference to our economy. There was a development from term to term, but each stage marks a new creation in this development. When this evolution of species ended, and all types were consummated in Man, creation closed, and God rested and was refreshed; 3 but only to begin again, in a third sabbatic economy, the continuous uncreating regulation of all minor evolutions: My Father worketh hitherto. 4 The record in Genesis thus includes both primary and secondary creation. Its opening words alone declare the former: In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. 5 Between that beginning and the chaos of the second verse, when the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep, and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters, 6 some have interposed a space, giving the widest possible or necessary latitude for the geological ages demanded by modern science. On this principle of interpretation the second verse itself leaves the operation of the forming and fashioning Spirit indeterminate. The light of revelation has risen only with dimness as yet upon the scene. The record has not for its object the details of creation as such; but only so far as they concern the coming history of mankind. This is thought to be obvious from the distinction between heaven and earth in the first verse, and the suppression of heaven in the second. The silence that reigns after the first great declaration is regarded as at once a warning and an encouragement both to theology and to geology: only there can the reconciliation be sought, and there it may be found. But, whatever of truth there may be in this, it still remains that the six days' work of creation blends the primary and secondary in one: the sabbatic commandment in the Decalogue being witness.

1 Exodus 31:17; 2 Genesis 1:2; 3 Exodus 31:17; 4 John 5:17; 5 Genesis 1:1; 6 Genesis 1:2.

2. The interpretation of the days must conform to this truth. Accordingly, we may understand the sublime description to mean that the enormous cycles of creative activity, the epochs of God whose periods are not as ours, are presented to us in our history as human epochs. There is then a double series of days, an upper and a lower, the one corresponding to the other. The upper and heavenly are the great cycles of creation which ended in the sabbatic cycle of the reconstructed economy with man at its head. The lower and earthly are the form they take to us in the representation of literal days, ending on the seventh day, hallowed for ever: each of our working days being used to symbolize its own term in the secondary creation of God, and our literal Sabbath His rest. The first day is the most comprehensive, including all down to the production of light: one period of untold duration which it pleased God to call a human day, with its evening and

morning. The last day is the long sabbatic rest with God, with man it is the hallowed day of rest. It is quite consistent with this that the record of the first day is left in such obscurity. It is in harmony with the simplicity of the early record to leave the unwritten history of the primitive earth to the researches of science, for which the Spirit of revelation has reserved this honor; and to regard the narrative as specially limiting the HEXAHE-MERON, or sixdays' work, to the fashioning of the earth as the future abode of man. While the days of the Biblical Cosmogony are creative days, in the most comprehensive sense of the term, they throw the emphasis on the periods of a new creation, or of a new formation, superimposed each on an earlier and, as it were, perished order of things. In the final creation all was very good; 1 hence every trace of the rapine and death which, through some unknown cause, had existed in its earlier epochal stages, were removed, to be detected, however, afterwards, and to be explained. It must be remembered that in this record every day of formation was a day also of absolute creation. No theory of evolution or development that seems to trace a regular succession of forms through which organic existence has passed, in obedience to a plastic law originally impressed upon matter, can be made consistent with Scripture. The days of the first chapter of Genesis are creative days: they spent their cycles and ended, the cycles being shorter and shorter, but each having on earth its memorial day. The last in which creation ceased is running its course now, and will run on to the new creation.

1 Genesis 1:31.

3. The glory of the Mosaic Cosmogony is its testimony to God, Who reigns supreme in it from beginning to end, whether as the Elohim of the first chapter, or the Jehovah-Elohim of the second. He is the Absolute Creator of a universe which is not Himself, evolved according to laws which in this record are exhibited as successively communicated by a series of fiats or impulses. The beginning of each great development is marked, and nothing more. So long as we hold fast this principle we shall find the original document unassailable: if we attempt to harmonies the order of the days with the exact results of scientific discovery we undertake a needless and a doubtful task. Science has nothing to object against a Creator of matter and of life: it knows no other origin of existence phenomenal. Whether, and at what points, the creating impulse infused new energies into the order of nature, science is utterly powerless to say. But the Bible distinctly, most distinctly, gives its answer: what science may call permanent causes were necessarily introduced: no induction has ever proved the contrary, however sometimes longing to do so. The reign of law is a favorite scientific notion: the adaptation of everything to its specific function, and the invariable submission of all things to its rule. The Scripture is no less precise: He commanded and they were created; He hath also stablished them for ever and ever; He hath made a decree which shall not pass. 1 The beautiful idea of Development has also full justice done to it in Scripture: a development that proceeds through its evenings and mornings, each good but leading to that which is finally very good in the consummation of man, and followed by a rest of formative activity which science admits, but admits sometimes to pervert. At this point we are met by two different classes of objection: one to the order of the development as given by Moses; the other to the general principle of successive impulses.

1 Psalms 148:5-6. THE ORDER OF THE MOSAIC CREATION.

1. The record of Genesis divides the creation into two parts: the inorganic and the organic. Each begins by the creation of light: on the first day, light cosmical, the radiating force of light and heat,

with its medium of ether; on the fourth day, light as connected for man with visible light-bearers. No valid objection arises here: science knows nothing of the amazing quantity of light which is dispersed from the son and stars, an infinitesimal portion only of which is intercepted by attendant planets; nor can it give any account of the origination of light and heat in the sun. On the second day, the earth was individualized as such, by the creation of its atmosphere; against this also there is no scientific argument. On the third day the earth's surface was constituted, and vegetation began. The Biblical relation of land to sea is in harmony with geological conclusions. But the question is, whether all the previous conditions of the terrestrial economy were sufficient to bring plants into existence without a creative fiat. Science admits a VITAL force in the plant: how many forms or types were created we are not told; herbs and trees are distinguished, but what after his kind 1 may include we cannot determine. In the order of nature, as well as in that of Scripture, plants, the food of all animals, must precede the animal creation. Geology has failed to prove that the fossil representations of the vegetable world are not, in some parts of the earth, below the remains of any animals. With the fifth day animal life began, for which the partial organic life of the vegetable prepared the way; and on the sixth day the inhabitants of the earth were formed, including man, but created according to a larger variety of types. The whole account is in the simplest form of words; but bears witness to a profound method. Each era preludes that which follows; each day is prophetic of the next; and while man is included among the mammalia his pre-eminence is asserted, as we shall hereafter see. The whole bears precisely the relation to science which we should expect in a record dated before science was known: giving the great outline which He alone could furnish Who was there from the beginning, and which He gave to a chosen people to be the first fragment of revelation.

1 Genesis 1:1.

2. He alone was there from the beginning; but as the days moved on in their slow procession His works were watched by other intelligences whose creation belonged to the first day; though of that the record gives no distinct account, being intended for man alone. What the book of Genesis may be in other worlds we know not. Our record is limited to ourselves. But we mark the chasms in it which we cannot supply: or which we can supply only by dangerous speculation. The great convulsion in the spiritual world is omitted: the fall of the angels, and its possible connection with the destiny of our earth. It has been a favorite hypothesis to assume that between the first verse and the second there is a break; that the words the earth was without form and void 1 indicate a disorganization and ruin which had come upon all things for reasons unknown; that the six days were periods of readjustment, or of a first restitution of all things answering to that restitution of all things 2 which will take place at the end. But tohu does not necessarily mean ruin: He created it not in vain, tohu, He formed it to be inhabited. 3 Moreover, this theory does not solve, it only evades, our great difficulties. In the strata of the earth's crust there lie the remains of animals which had lived under the dominion of disease, and rapine, and death: a prelude of human history which is as deep a mystery, and must remain so, as that other prelude, the sin of angels.

1 Genesis 1:2; 2 Acts 3:21; 3 Isaiah 45:18.

EXTRA-BIBLICAL COSMOGONIES. In almost all the religious annals of mankind there are to be found traditions of the creation, which, for the most part, are entirely independent of the Hebrew Scriptures as to their origin, while their form is often strikingly parallel with the Mosaic account

They are found among nations to which the Hebrew Scriptures could never have penetrated, from the ancient Aryan tribes to the islands of the Pacific. Yet a few points, common to all, seem to indicate one primeval Cosmogony, of which, as we believe, the Biblical is the genuine text. In the Indian Vedas the Eternal One thought " I will create worlds," and water came into existence, with the germs of all life; but we read of the original chaos, the formless mist, in which being was mirrored, and the creative word. In the Persian Zendavesta, Ormuzd, the god of light, as well as Ahriman, the god of darkness, arose out of the abyss of primitive being; the former fashioned the world in six long successive periods, a remarkable parallel with the account in Genesis. With this agrees most strangely the Etruscan cosmogony from quite a different quarter. In the Egyptian, as handed down by Diodorus Siculus, the moving wind separated heaven and earth out of chaos, and the successive periods of formation followed. In the Phoenician the origin of all was a dark, windy chaos, on which the Spirit rested; producing the original matter of creation. Hesiod’s Theogony begins with the universal void, and goes on with an order of production that strangely agrees with our record, though many of the details are inverted. Not unlike this is the Latin, according to Ovid’s version. In all these the chaos, the brooding spirit, and the successive separations and creations of Genesis, appear in some form or other. But there the parallel mostly ends. The grotesque and utterly extravagant conceits from which every instinct recoils, and of which the imagination is ashamed, — the " world-egg " playing a prominent part from China to the South Seas—place a great gulf between all the cosmogonies of the world and the sublime simplicity of the record in which faith hears the voice of God and nought beside.

EVOLUTION. With the modern, or rather the revived, theories of Evolution, the Cosmogony of science, we have nothing to do save as they are related to theology. They are considered at this point, because they are not necessarily to be placed among Pantheistic, Dualistic, or Materialist errors. Undoubtedly, they are propounded by many in these three several interests, or rather in the interests of the first and last of the three. But it cannot be too distinctly remembered that their entire terminology, almost from beginning to end, implies that they are describing the production of all things phenomenal out of things that do not appear through the operation of some laws which necessarily connote a power guiding the law. Evolution is either the law by which that power constructs the inorganic universe, or that by which it orders the development of life in all its manifestations.

COSMICAL EVOLUTION.

Bold hypothesis, sustained by mathematical science, has assumed that elementary matter existed in a highly attenuated state, for the expression of which every material word is too gross. This nebula, fire-mist, or dust of creation had in it or received all the powers and potentialities of the vast future. Some flash of energy threw this silent depository of all known laws into eternal activity. Rotation, radiation, cooling, produce centrifugal force which detaches the nucleus of future planets, and these by known laws necessarily seeking their origin again are thrown into orbits, meanwhile throwing off in their turn, during the process, attendants of their own. On the vastest scale this is the universe; on a smaller scale the solar system; on the smallest scale our little earth with its endless molecular, chemical, and dynamical laws. But the central fires are not lighted to burn for ever. The dissipation of heat must sometime bring all motion to a standstill; for that heat, so far as science knows, does not return to its place. Systems must therefore collapse, to engender heat for other great evolutions into system. But this cannot go on for ever. The beginning

of any system can be calculated; so can its end. This rough sketch of the Nebular Hypothesis gives us a Cosmogony which is not inconsistent with the Scriptural Genesis as to its beginning; nor is it inconsistent with the prophecies of Scripture, as to its end. But the gigantic fallacy is that such mathematicians as Laplace should think that they have no need of the hypothesis of a God; and that such philosophers as Hegel should say that the final cause of the universe is only its inward nature. Whence the forces residing in matter? Whence the beautiful order into which it falls? Whence the variety of elementary substances with all their endowments of gravitation, chemical affinity, and magnetic attraction? And how could these evolve the minds that make them all objective, and, by becoming their historians, show that they are themselves of another and a higher order?

ORGANIC DEVELOPMENT.

One of the most remarkable evolutions of modern science is the attempt to account for the phenomena by assuming the principle that from one primordial germ all the infinite varieties of organic life have been developed through a very long series of ages. Perhaps, it would be more fair to say that students of natural history have thought themselves justified, by a great number of observations, in supposing this to be the law of the living universe. But whether they work downwards from a bold hypothesis, or work upwards by bold generalizations, the fact remains the same, that this is what the theory known as the Darwinian aims at. If, however, the law is not absolute, if there are exceptions anywhere, the simplicity of their cosmogony is gone, and the principle of the Mosaic creation must be conceded. The theory is most exacting. It is held by pantheistic Positivists, who imagine they believe in immanent final causes, and undirected evolution; it is held also by the Agnostic thinkers, who muse over the unknowable force that displays such cunning; and it is held by men who assume that the Eternal Creator simply appointed this method of evolving His universe. These last believe that Heredity, the inscrutable power of transmitting peculiarities; Natural Selection, or the survival of nature’s best types; and, lastly, a Law Unknown in human knowledge, conduct the great development under the eye of the Eternal Whose rest, as the Creator of all, began not on the seventh day but on the first.

1. The continuity of this development suffers a fatal breach at the outset: it has no link between the inorganic and the organic worlds. The Mosaic Genesis has that link; it tells us that the Creator has prepared the material world by progressive stages to be the habitation of life. And the New-Testament Genesis tells us that the development is yet proceeding towards a consummation when all things will again be made new. The modern hypothesis desires that this should be left an open question: it may hereafter appear that under certain conditions inorganic matter may be formed into cells containing the germ of life, in which case the continuity would be complete. Meanwhile, the doctrine of Biogenesis, that all life comes from life, holds the field against all experiment, or rather in the strength of all experiment. Spontaneous generation has never yet been attested. But that is not the only gap. The genesis of a new species of any kind, whether of plant or animal, has never been observed by man: has the universe come to its consummation, and reached its sabbatic rest? Again, it is the opinion of the majority of those competent to speak that there are absolute limits to the variability of species; that many fossil transitional forms are utterly and most conspicuously absent. And, most fatal gap of all, the leap from the highest approximate to the appearance of man himself is one over a great gulf as fixed as that between Paradise and the lower Hades. But of Man we must speak hereafter.

2. As held by its best advocates this theory pays a high tribute to the truth against which it seems to contend. No writings have done so much, certainly none have done more, to open men's eyes to the infinite variety, and beauty, and wonderfulness of the adjustments of the vegetable and animal worlds, than those which are written in opposition to the doctrine of occasional Divine interventions in the economy of things. Moreover, they have called attention to some truths that are too generally neglected as to the degree in which it has pleased the Creator to use the principle which they so much dishonor by exaggeration. He has committed much to development. Within certain limits the fauna and the flora of our earth are replenished and beautified by manifold variations, through which, however, His original types are clearly seen by every unbiased eye. They have also taught us to appreciate the wonderful relation in which man is placed to the creatures whose all is bound up with the earth; that, as created out of the dust, he is a development of older physical types, a final development on which evolution has spent itself, found worthy at last to be the receptacle of an immortal spirit By tracing so elaborately the dim and impersonal reflections of our mental and moral characteristics in the lower creatures, it has read us some important lessons: pre-eminently, the necessity of accurately distinguishing between instinct and reason; between the only " unconscious cerebration " of which we ought to speak and the thought of a personal thinker; between the animal soul, which, using a physical brain, may have its resemblances in the brutes that have brains also, and the immortal spirit whose consciousness and conscience and feeling for the infinite can have nothing resembling them in the lower economy. But, when this theory of long, slow, cyclical development is burdened with the production of all things, the growth of moral and spiritual sentiments included, it has two unrelenting opponents: Science cannot allow time enough since the calculated beginning of the solar system; and Religion protests in the name of God, and for the honor of His incarnate Son, and for the dignity of man himself; the descendant of Adam, [Which was] the son of God.1

1 Luke 3:38. THE MOTIVE AND END OF THE CREATION.

Supposing the Scriptural doctrine of creation established against Pantheism, Dualism, and Materialism, and as the free act of an Infinite Spirit, it remains to ask concerning the purpose of God in the production of finite nature. As soon as we are disencumbered of the pantheistic and materialistic notion of an immanent necessity of all things being as they are, and separate the finite from the Infinite, we are compelled by the constitution of our nature to ask the Why of creaturely existence. We must seek and cannot rest till we find a cause of all things before they are, and a reason of all things when they are. The question of the final cause is as urgent in the human spirit as the question of the originating cause. The latter is easily answered, and we have been satisfied as to that. But the former, the final cause of all things, is not so easily answered. It might be reserved for the doctrine of Providence, to which it strictly belongs. But it cannot be altogether omitted here. To the humble reader of Scripture nothing seems more obvious than at once to answer: The universe was brought into being for the display of the Divine glory in the diffusion of His communicative goodness. But, simple as this solution seems, each branch of it is burdened with difficulties, and the whole must be supplemented by another clause: according to a design the issues of which are to human reason now, and possibly may be for ever, unfathomable.

1. No reverent mind can doubt that the manifestation of the Divine glory is a worthy end of all things. But it must be remembered that the Scriptures, our only guide, do not make this the only end: they speak of the glory of God as being proclaimed, and of all creatures as brought into being

for His pleasure, and for Himself; but they do not, in express terms, assert that the final cause of creaturely existence is the display of the Divine attributes.

We can hardly sever from such a thought the idea of a necessary manifestation: His glory must be revealed, and ought not to be made subject even in appearance to the law of design and final causes. And, to speak with reverence, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion, that, if the manifestation of Deity is the final end of creation, creation must be made eternal. But the free determination of a personal Spirit to bring a universe into being must have some place in its design for that love which neither in God nor in man seeks only its own things. Hence the true heart of all catholic theology has added the second clause: in the diffusion of His communicative goodness.

2. On the other hand, while a motive of creation was undoubtedly the communicative goodness of God, which brought numberless beings into existence to rejoice in them and make them blessed, the mind cannot rest satisfied in this alone; for the world was created in the foreknowledge of its evil. Men who make Divine benevolence the supreme motive in the creation are tempted to reduce the evil of sin by making this, as Leibnitz did, the best possible world, on the whole, for the ultimate diffusion of happiness. This is termed OPTIMISM, and is harmonized with Christianity by assuming that the great Restoration in Christ will make the evil subserve an infinitely greater good. Moreover, those who insist that, the nature of God being love, the creation of objects of that love was a necessity in the Divine Being Himself, forget that in the Infinite essence love has its own interior satisfaction eternally in the intercommunion of the Three Persons.

3. The only sufficient answer, therefore, is that the ultimate final cause of creation is unfathomable. The supreme design is a secret not yet unveiled. When our Lord said, in reply to a question which closely bordered on the origin of evil, that the works of God should be made manifest, 1 He suggested the display of all God’s perfections, including His love, but put His answer in such a form as to shut out any further human inquiry. The Creator has given being to a finite universe for the display of all His perfections, for the glory of His name. But we are limited to our own portion of it. To us the universe is our own world; and we know that creation and redemption are bound up in one. He Who created mankind was the Same Who redeemed the race; He Who redeemed it created it for redemption. And we believe and are sure, though the mystery is unfathomable, that God’s name will be glorified for ever in the issue of redemption, under the sovereign ascendancy of love. So, with regard to the wider universe of creation generally, we must repose in the assurance that it is the sphere of the manifestation of Divine perfections, under the sovereign ascendancy of His goodness, but with an ulterior end transcending all finite thought. For the rest, this subject links Creation with Providence, and will return upon us.

1 John 9:3. THE CREATED UNIVERSE.

Sundry comprehensive terms are used in Scripture to embrace and describe the sum of creaturely existence. The most convenient theological distribution of the entire Creation for our present purpose is that which divides it into the Spiritual World, the Material Universe, and Man as uniting both in himself. The Old Testament begins its announcement of the creation of all things by saying that God created THE HEAVEN AND THE EARTH, 1 and retains that designation throughout its whole compass to the end. The New Testament adds many other general descriptive definitions: pánta and ta pánta all things, 2 modified as things visible and things invisible; 3 ktíseoos, the creation of God; 4 kosmos, the world 5 in its form and order; aioónas, the worlds, in their secular

succession. These expressions approach very nearly the classical to pan 6 of ancient philosophy, the Universum, or the modern term Universe as the system of created things.

1 Genesis 1:1; 2 John 1:3; 3 Colossians 1:16; 4 Revelation 3:14; 5 John 17:5; 6 Hebrews 1:2.

ANGELS AND SPIRITS.

Revelation gives a large place to an order of intelligences higher than man: the history of creation, the records of providence, and the economy of redemption, connect them with mankind in various ways. We now consider them simply as part of the creation of God, and as to their place in the economy of things. They are everywhere designated Spirits and Angels. Being Spirits they are represented as, to a certain extent, independent of matter; highly exalted in their faculties; diversified in their range of existence; under a law of probation; and, as a result of that probation, distributed into two classes of good and evil. As Angels, they are represented as attendants on the Supreme, employed in the service of His providence; and especially as connected for good or evil with the history of the Divine purpose in redemption, from its origin upon earth throughout all its processes to its close at the final judgment.

SPIRITS. The name Spirits is given to these creatures of God to denote their specific nature, concerning which we are of necessity shut up entirely to the teaching of Holy Scripture.

1. They occupy a sphere of existence less closely connected with the material universe than that of man in his present estate. Their spirituality, however, must not be misunderstood. It seems to be synonymous with invisibility in the only passage which directly links them with the creaturely universe, or records their creation: by Christ were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible. 1 God alone is pure essential Spirit: these created spirits are clothed upon with ethereal vestures, such as Paul describes when he says, There is a spiritual body. 2 Thus our Lord tells us that the children of the resurrection are isángeloi, equal unto the angels. 3 Having a more subtle organization than man, they are at present higher in their range of faculties: greater in power and might 4 and angels that excel in strength. 5 But what their faculties are, what organs they use, and what is the bond between their psychology and our own, we know not. They were created at once and in a wide variety of grades. Though the description thrones, dominions, principalities, powers, 6 partly refers to their ministerial offices, there are other indications of a boundless range of existence in the super-terrestrial world, answering to the abundance and diversity of life upon earth; but without the law of species, and admitting of no increase by generation or development: they are all and individually, as created at once one by one, sons of God 7 by direct filiation. Hence the revelation of Scripture discloses precisely such a continuation upwards of the scale of being as analogy would suggest: as in the lower orders the species is all and the individual nothing, as in man the species and the individual are blended, so in the upper world the species is lost, and each is apart and alone before God: all, however, being marshaled and distributed into orders of the laws of which we know nothing save that they do not include species and generation.

1 Colossians 1:16; 2 1 Corinthians 15:44; 3 Luke 20:36; 4 2 Peter 2:11; 5 Psalms 103:20; 6 Colossians 1:16; 7 Job 1:6.

2. All spirits were created in the image of God: and their first estate was probationary: this law of the moral government of the Most High seems to be universal. In the constitution of their nature

lay the possibility of falling from their allegiance. The issue of probation was the fall of a portion of these spirits, with One as their head. These, sharing his rebellion, were condemned with him. We read once of the condemnation of the devil:1 a remarkable expression, which can have but one meaning, as no created being has the authority to condemn. Hence we gather that Satan, before a tribunal of which we have no record, was convicted of pride and cast out of his high place; doomed to a degradation commensurate with the height of his former dignity. Many fell into his apostasy, and were condemned to the same ruin: how many we need not ask, though it is observable that all the notes of multitude which the Scripture uses are employed to swell the numbers of the good spirits. On the other side we hear one say, my name is Legion, 2 and that they constituted the third part of the stars of heaven: 3 words on which we cannot lay any stress. But their sentence is for mysterious reasons not yet fully executed: they are reserved for a last judgment and sentence: know ye not that we shall judge angels? 4 The great majority—not of the angels that sinned 5—were confirmed in their state of holiness for ever: they are, therefore, elect angels; 6 elect, as in the case of man, not through preordination, but through approval and separation from the doomed of their own order.

Hence, they are also termed Saints: He came with ten thousands of saints. 7 The whole economy of the angel world as known to man is divided into two orders, retaining severally their orderly ranks, as a good and an evil hierarchy. The Epistle to the Ephesians, which gives in compensation to those who burned their books of curious arts the most explicit revelation touching the spiritual world, refers in the beginning to the ranks of the better class, and in the end to the ranks of the fallen. But it must be observed that the evil are generally designated spirits, the good are almost invariably angels: the exceptions on either side are few. The spirits of evil are pre-eminently Satan or the Devil, and demons, or unclean spirits; 8 Satan the first sinner, the first tempter, the true Antichrist, and, retaining one of his archangel names, the prince or god of this world; 9 and devils, daimónia, who in great numbers troubled the bodies and souls of men while their Head assailed the Redeemer. When we reach the doctrine of Sin it will be necessary to introduce these higher intelligences again.

1 1 Timothy 3:6; 2 Mark 5:9; 3 Revelation 12:4; 4 1 Corinthians 6:3; 5 2 Peter 2:4; 6 1 Timothy 5:21; 7 Deuteronomy 33:2; 8 Mark 1:27; Zechariah 13:2; 9 John 14:30.

3. While the good and unfallen spirits are generally the Holy Angels, and the evil spirits of Scripture are not generally termed by that name, yet these are also represented as subserving the purposes of the Supreme. Even if they are the servants of their prince, both they and he alike must directly or indirectly, by command or by permission, do the behest of the only Supreme Will. In the mystery of that will they are left in the free restraint or the restrained freedom of the sphere of the redeeming economy. Satan is the prince of the power of the air, 1 and his hosts are spiritual wickedness in high places; 2 but both the air and the high places are within the Savior’s domain: His authority compasses our world, and no line limits it outward. Still more strange is it that both in ancient and in modern revelation the ministers of evil are exhibited as in the upper spiritual world: a true wonder in heaven. 3 But the term is used here symbolically for the spiritual sphere only. It may be noted, finally, that while the Divine Being uses the good spirits to chastise wickedness, almost always the evil spirits are used to discipline the offending righteous.

1 Ephesians 2:2; 2 Ephesians 6:12; 3 Revelation 12:3.

ANGELS. The denomination Angels, which runs through the Scriptures as pervadingly as the name of God Himself, before Whom they stand, is used with reference to their ministerial service; as the Hebrew mal'ak and the Greek aggelos signify. With the exception of some few passages, such as the Devil and his angels; 1 Messenger, 2 or angel, of Satan; the Dragon fought and his angels 3 — which do not use the term in an official sense, and are therefore scarcely exceptions, — the angels are the attendants on God and ministers of His will throughout all the economies of His government. This gives them their glory and their grace in the Bible.

1 Matthew 25:41; 2 2 Corinthians 12:7; 3 Revelation 12:7.

1. There can be no higher description of them than that they wait upon God. The Lord is the Lord of hosts, 1 and the holy angels are His sons: 2 all the sons of God shouted for joy. 3 Their joy is the joy of worship: they sing the doxology to the Holy Trinity —to man as yet unrevealed, but revealed to them—in Isaiah's mystical temple; 4 they receive the commandment, which they were quick to obey, to worship the Son when He was brought into the world; 5 and they descend to sympathies with, if indeed they do not join in, the devotion of the Church of God among men. So near are they to the manifested Divine glory, and so do they reflect it, that they are called gods: —worship Him, all ye gods!6 though this, as in the case of human judges, receiving the same designation, may refer rather to their representative character as executing their functions in the Divine name. In this character they are known as Cherubim: forms which are symbolical, rather than descriptive, and signify the forces of the created universe, attendant upon God, but not God Himself; and Seraphim, also representing the creature before God and extolling His perfections, as unslumbering Watchers, 7 burning with Divine love. But the highest honor conferred upon them is this, that the Supreme unites them with Himself as His court: — Let us go down! 8 includes them, though the US points to another mystery. Throughout the Old Testament the Lord is in the assembly of His saints; 9 into which even the representative of evil spirits might enter, before Christ came to cast them out finally: and Satan came also among them. 10 But this leads to the ministry of these blessed spirits of heaven.

1 Isaiah 47:4; 2 Job 1:6; 3 Job 38:7; 4 Isaiah 6:1-13; 5 Hebrews 1:6; 6 Psalms 97:7; 7 Daniel 4:17; 8 Genesis 1:26; 9 Psalms 89:7 : 10 Job 1:6.

2. They are called ministering spirits, leitourgiká pneúmata: 1 ministering to God, that is, in His general government of the universe, in the economy of redemption, and in His providence over the saints. As to the first, we have no power to determine the extent of their operation in the physical universe; but we read of such occasional interventions — for instance, the slaying of the Assyrian host, 2 the phenomena at Mount Sinai 3 — as forbid any doubt concerning their rare and occasional ministry in this domain: if, indeed, rare and occasional, of which there is no proof. But in the history of redemption they appear as statedly and fixedly as Prophets and Apostles themselves: especially at the great crises, the Creation, the Lawgiving, the History of the Incarnate Lord, seen of angels, 4 and the dread solemnities of the Last Day. In this high service they seem to have always acted in the order of a hierarchy. For the loftiest functions—for the guardianship of Israel in the old economy, the announcement of Christ and the protection of His kingdom in the new—there are Archangels, though so called only in the New Testament.

First Michael, 5 Who is like God? whose name declares that he, the highest in the scale of created beings, the first-born OF every creature 6 as Christ is the First-born BEFORE every creature, for

ever remembers his finite creatureliness. He accordingly vindicates Monotheism in the Old Testament and is the conqueror of Satan in the New: Who is like God? Then Gabriel, 7 Hero of God, the supreme representative in the heavenly host of God's executive will, who in both the Old and the New Testaments announces the coming of the Christ: the angelic Forerunner, as the Baptist was the human. It is probable that Satan, then Lucifer, or known by some name that he has lost, was the third in this angelic trinity. Daniel's princes of Grecia and Persia may without violence be interpreted of human potentates. 8 The highest angels seem alone in the Old Testament to have been employed in human service: always, however, in subordination to One Who, called an angel, is the Lord Himself. He, as will hereafter be seen, was the Angel Jehovah, or the Angel of Jehovah, the Angel of the Covenant, a Divine Person Who, before He became man, appeared in human form, taking the name though He never took the nature of angels. Always distinguished from Him are the pre-eminent ministers from the spiritual world in the Old-Testament economy, who were thus prepared for the higher service of ministering to the Lord when He came, Whose entire incarnate life was seen of angels.9 Especially they drew near to Him in His sorrow: absent at the Transfiguration, but necessary to Gethsemane. They do nut attend the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost: they are comparatively lost in His higher dispensation, and their absence on that day preludes their absence now. Not that they are wholly absent: they still and ever are ministers for them who shall be heirs of salvation. 10 Not as GUARDIAN ANGELS in the strict sense of the word; it is rather for the sake of the heirs of salvation that they minister. Their angels are not the guardians of children individually, any more than Peter's angel11 was his specific guardian. Hence while the tenor of the Word of God permits us to include angel-ministry among the all things which work together for good, 12 it is careful so to describe and define their service to mankind as to render both unreasonable and sinful every form of the worshipping of angels.13

1 Hebrews 1:14; 2 2 Kings 19:35; 3 Deuteronomy 33:2; 4 1 Timothy 3:16; 5 Daniel 10:13; 6 Colossians 1:15; 7 Luke 1:19; 8 Daniel 10:20; 9 1 Timothy 3:16; 10 Hebrews 1:14; 11 Acts 12:15; 12 Romans 8:28; 13 Colossians 2:18.

HISTORICAL.

Whatever else of theological interest belongs to Angelology may be touched upon in a brief notice of its historical aspects: with reference, first to Superstition, and secondly to Infidelity.

1. The Jewish and the Christian Churches have their respective developments of superstition on this subject, the former being the basis of the latter. After the Captivity, Jewish theology betrayed to some extent the infection of its contact with foreign speculations, especially in Persia: the Apocrypha abounds with evidences of a departure from the simple teaching of the Old Testament, as that takes its last form in Daniel.

During the interval before the final settlement of the New-Testament canon there appears a tendency in the Christian Church to honor the angels unduly. The seventh Ecumenical Council at Nicaea, A.D. 787, concedes to them proskuneései, though not the Divine latreúoo. The Nicene Creed, issuing from an earlier and better Council, had declared that they were created; and Irenaeus had protested against invocation of angels. But the evil made steady progress in the general corruption of Christian doctrine, and received its final confirmation at Trent. There is no error more distinctly guarded against in Scripture: Hóra meé, See thou do it not . . . worship God. 1

Superstition has made the world of evil angels also its domain. Forgetting the great change that the coming of Christ has effected, and that the influence of evil spirits has been more effectually controlled than it was before, the Christian Church during almost its entire history down to the Reformation was haunted by an unevangelical idea of their operation in all regions of the Divine Government, physical and spiritual. Hence the place given to Satan, as having a right to the redemption price, in the doctrine of the Atonement; hence the elaborate ceremonials of exorcism; hence the abject dread of the powers of malign spirits in the infliction of the natural calamities of life: hence the notion of personal contacts with the Evil One; and hence, lastly, the judicial treatment of witchcraft and sorcery down to a recent time.

1 Revelation 19:10.

2. But infidelity sweeps away, not only the superstitious appendages of the revealed truth concerning angels, but the revealed truth itself. In its more reckless form it has renounced the whole economy of the angel world. Though the Biblical revelation only confirms the inferences of analogical reasoning and the universal instinct of mankind, skepticism not only doubts but denies the existence of beings superior to man: thus rejecting in fact the whole Bible with the very fabric of which this revelation is interwoven. It specially argues against the personality of Satan: either returning to the Manichsean delusion of an independent power autothuhs and agennhtos, or making him merely the personification of evil which undeniably exists. But here Rationalistic Christian theology joins the infidel. It is enough to say that the person of the Enemy of Christ is as distinctly presented in the history of revelation, though not so fully described, nor so constantly present, as the Person of the Lord Himself. There is nothing more remarkable, nothing more worthy of study, than the parallel development of the representative of sin and the Redeemer from sin throughout the Bible. In the same way the argument against demoniacal possession may be met. Though Scripture allows that suffering, as part of the penalty of sin, is, like death itself, in some respect in the ministry of Satan, it makes a distinction between all trouble or wickedness arising from within, and the torment inflicted by evil spirits from without. There are in the New Testament daimonizouenio, persons demonized, who, in body and soul, if not in spirit, are under the special influence of daemons. That this was a reality, and not a style of language accommodated to Jewish notions, is evident from the combination of healing diseases and casting out devils in the Savior’s commission, as also from His habitually addressing Himself to personal beings when He cast them out. There is a grand consistency in the Scriptural revelation on this subject. The Old Testament gives some distant indications of such possession; when our Lord appears there is an outbreak of these powers on earth: but the chief enemy is always pre-eminent, as appears in the fact that the last Evangelist withdraws his attention from all besides him, never mentioning the daemons. And it is an illustration of the same consistency that their full force in human affairs has never been felt since the Conqueror said: Now shall the prince of this world be cast out. 1 How far they are still permitted to seduce men, and what part they play in the modern devices of so-called spiritualistic science, which professes to call them in as evidence of another world, we need not now inquire.

1 John 12:31.

3. This last observation will apply to the whole topic which is here closed: the angels have retreated from their high preeminence. The doctrine concerning them belongs to the entire

scheme of revelation, as in course of delivery, and pervades every part of it. The angel world is around us everywhere in Biblical theology, and we must prepare ourselves by a firm faith at the outset for the reappearance of its representatives as we proceed through the several doctrines. It has been viewed here only or chiefly in its relation to the universe as created, but at every stage in our future course it will meet us again.

Meanwhile, it may be well to observe at this point that the ANGELOLOGY of the Bible is always subordinated to human interests; and, saving as they are connected with redemption wrought out and administered, spirits good and evil, or rather spirits and angels, need not and should not be too curiously investigated. Why askest thou thus after My name? said One in the Old Testament. Seeing, it is secret, He added, doubtless for a higher reason than what is here suggested: His name was as yet concealed, and in a certain sense is concealed for ever. But the caution is generally appropriate. The student, and the preacher especially, should in this matter limit himself to the clear testimonies of the Oracle, not keeping back the truth from the skeptic, but not pandering to a false Spiritualism, as the modern word is. Both evil spirits and angels may, on these conditions, most fruitfully and profitably enter into practical theology, even as they necessarily occupy a large and important place in dogmatics. THE MATERIAL UNIVERSE. The material universe as such occupies a considerable place in revelation, which establishes a few cardinal principles of great importance to theology. Matter is declared to have been created by God, though no name is given to it; fashioned into the orderly arrangement of systems, it is the Kosmos; these are the result of successive creations, which are indicated by the term worlds. We are taught that the universe of matter was ordained to be the scene of life, passing through its several stages up to life spiritual; but the inhabitation of other worlds, and their relations to redemption, are questions which have little light thrown upon them in the Word of God. Lastly, as the revelation of Scripture concerns only that part of the universe which belongs to man, we cannot draw any certain conclusion as to the final destiny of the universe of matter from the testimony of prophecy concerning the end of our heaven and earth: we are left to the inferences of analogy. These general principles may be usefully applied to many current theories and cosmical speculations.

MATTER.

Matter, or ulh, has no name in Scripture: it is indicated there generally as having been at first without form and void, diffused, unorganized, and lifeless. Science is left free to discover and give its own names to the primary elements. The atoms of the universe and their molecular arrangements are never once alluded to: they are left to man’s discovery. But the same God Who is the Father of spirits was the Creator of pure matter. He impressed their unchangeable properties upon all the particles of the universe, created, in their number and potentialities, like the angels, at once. Before this truth Materialism, ancient and modern, in its variety of forms as a theory, vanishes. In ancient philosophy it was the anima mundi, or soul of the world, or natura naturans that took the place of God.

Modern Materialism, through all its phases down to Positivism, makes everything, including the phenomena of mind, physical; and, while acknowledging that it is as yet far from being able to account for the facts, and that the molecular laws of mind, feeling, and will are perhaps undiscoverable, it nevertheless asserts that they are the results of changes in matter and governed by invariable laws, directed by something inscrutable and unknowable behind.

Materialism has been the same in every age: modern science has not advanced one step beyond ancient philosophy; except in this, that it gives up that vestige of instinct towards God that Pantheism exhibited. The ancient theorists thought of a plastic soul in things: pan-Theism. The modern theorists think only of matter as the vehicle of energy: pan-Materialism. One of its tendencies is to resolve matter into a congregation of forces; by which it unconsciously argues itself in a circle back to God.

Scripture, which asserts that the beginning of the living creature was a new Divine act, vindicates the reality of matter from the philosophy which would resolve it into nothing.

Idealism and Realism preside over the whole range of speculation on this subject respectively. The former as represented by Berkeley denies the existence, or the possibility of proving the existence, of any substance behind the phenomena which affect our senses: these senses being ordained to see either in God Himself, or according to some unknown laws, what seems to be matter. But, however that notion may be qualified, it falls before the early testimony which tells us that the material universe was formed before there were any creatures to receive its impressions. So all the more recent theories of force which would annihilate objective substance as the vehicle of energy must yield to the evidence of a creation which preceded all life. This hypothesis seems to breathe into the inorganic universe a kind of life, called force, which preceded its organic forms; but it has no support It would seem, like Berkeley's theory, to be a useful ally of the theologian, in as far as it saves us from the necessity of believing in a creation apart from God; but the testimony of Genesis confirms the universal realistic instinct of man, that there is a substance behind the phenomena of matter. As it regards the scientific theories of the persistence of force, the conservation of energy, and the correlation of its physical manifestations, they do not in the slightest degree affect theology, until they penetrate the region of life. When it is affirmed that physical and vital forces are correlated and convertible—in other words, that all the phenomena of thought, and feeling, and will, are only transformed forces of matter—sound reasoning is violated as well as Scripture. It may be said that the material basis of animal and vegetable life is something in the molecular arrangement of its particles; and this may be called protoplasm. But it cannot be shown that anything but living matter communicates or feeds life. Spontaneous generation is a figment that Materialists have made their as yet unknown God. The true God giveth life, and breath, and all things. 1 But, as man's body was created for the instant inhabitation of his living soul, so the matter of the universe was intended to be the instant abode of life. That life was breathed into it by the Spirit Who brooded over our chaos: He is the Lord and Giver of life in every manifestation of it, from the most elementary protoplasm up to that which beholds the face of God.

1 Acts 17:25.

OTHER WORLDS. The testimony of Revelation to the universe of other worlds than ours is limited. But what we have is consistent with every discovery and every rational hypothesis of modern science. The heavens have their host: to us an ambiguous word, which refers either to the worlds or to the inhabitants of those worlds, but is in the Scripture limited to the physical universe. As ordered in systems the universe is a kosmos, as in our Lord's words, before the foundation of the world: 1 the ancient use of the term to signify the ordered whole of the heavenly bodies is retained in the New Testament, though the common use limits it to man's world. Hence it is too pan, the universe; which, however, is never a unity in the Bible, heaven and earth being sundered.

Viewed in the orderly succession of its creations the universe is made up of the aiones: through Whom also He made the worlds, 2 that is, the worlds which fill the ages of so-called past eternity. One of the first exercises of faith is said to embrace the fact that these worlds were framed, kateertísthai, 3 as the phenomenal, or in their present appearance, ra pXeiroficva. The silence of the Scripture as to the inhabitants of these worlds is unbroken. But there is nothing either in its words or in its silence that forbids the reasonable inferences of analogy. The one point at which the vast extent of the peopled realms of the universe touches theological faith is the immeasurable dignity conferred on man's insignificance by the Incarnation. More than once the ancient Scripture seems to be oppressed though not overwhelmed by this truth.

"We can interpret our meaning, at least, into those passages which so often bid the children of the earth to lift up their eyes and behold the innumerable hosts of heaven.

What is man, that Thou art mindful of him? 4 But in the Creator's relations to His creatures there is no great and small, no greater and less: the transcendent mystery of the Divine condescension must be regarded in itself, and without the most distant reference to the insignificance of man in relation to the universe. The Old Testament derives a lesson from the contemplation that knows no doubt or dismay or fear: its faith is strengthened rather than endangered by every view of the steadfast and unviolated ordinances of heaven. Lift up your eyes on Ugh, and behold Who hath created these things, that bringeth out their host by number: He calleth them all by names, by the greatness of His might, for that He is strong in power; not one faileth. 5 All are equally great in His sight: NOT ONE FAILETH; each has the burden of its own glorious destiny.

1 John 17:24; 2 Hebrews 1:2; 3 Hebrews 11:3; 4 Psalms 8:4; 5 Isaiah 40:26. THEIR COMPARATIVE INSIGNIFICANCE.

There is no grander truth revealed than the comparative insignificance of the creature as material. All the constellations of systems in the universe—or, as the Scripture says, the heavens —are the work of the Divine hand, which shall roll them up as a garment, and they shall be changed. 1 They are of less value in all their vast extent and grandeur than one immortal spirit, And with the utmost tranquility it is said that all the phenomena of creation will pass away, be dissolved. 2 In the spirit of Jonah we take pity upon the great works of man which are to be destroyed. But the greater works of God are destroyed, and it costs the Supreme no thought! As to the substance behind the phenomena, and its reconstruction, more will be said hereafter.

1 Hebrews 1:12; 2 2 Peter 3:11.

MAN.

Man, or mankind, occupies the noblest and most ample section in the history of creation as revealed in Scripture. This is in harmony with the central place which he occupies in Divine revelation generally, as the object around whom all revolves. His pre-eminence as a creature is noted in the circumstantials of dignity attending his origin; and in the relations he bears to the other orders of the creature. But it is chiefly seen in the constituent elements of his nature, reflecting the Divine Image in which he was formed. this being the basis of his dignity and prerogatives as the head of the earthly creation; in the organic unity of man as constituting one species; and the connection between the original estate, fall, and redemption of mankind as he was a probationary creature. This department is sometimes called ANTHROPOLOGY, a term which in science means

the zoological and biological study of human nature. Not including formally, though not absolutely excluding, the physical, physiological, and psychological study of our species, it is its theological bearing that we mainly keep in view. This, however, must not be too narrowly limited; such topics as the Original State of Man, the Image of God in Man, Man before the Fall, do not exhaust it. It is better to regard the whole as a wide field of which these subjects are only sections. THE NATURE OF MAN. The Divine record represents to us our first father, Adam, as the end and consummation of all creating acts, and gives his twofold nature a peculiar relation to both the spiritual and the material worlds. In the unity of body and soul, the one taken from the earth and the other breathed into him by his Maker, he is the link between these two great spheres.

1. The bringing of man into the world is in Genesis the result of a special design. And God said, Let Us make man: 1 the first intimation in Scripture of the Divine counsel preceding the act. Of the other creatures it is said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life 2 . . .. Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind; 3 but every word touching the origin of the human race indicates the issue of all former purposes: the creation of A NEW THING. Hence the emphatic double account of man's beginning: generally in Genesis 1:1-31 the introduction of the race with its pre-eminent dignity into the system of things, and, particularly, in Genesis 2:1-25. the physical details of his origin with specific intervention for the formation of the Mother of all living. Hence also the clause in the second account which returns to the creating act to show that the body of the first man was immediately fashioned out of the dust, and that the origin of his life was the breathing into him of a living soul. 4 The same Divine act produced both body and soul, without any interval. This is said of no other creature; though the real distinction between man and the lower creation is not in the words of this verse, but in the first note of man's origin: Let Us make man in Our image.5 1 Genesis 1:26; 2 Genesis 1:20; 3 Genesis 1:24; 4 Genesis 2:7; 5 Genesis 1:26.

2. This gives breath of lives a higher meaning: there is a spirit inMan 1:1 as well as an animal life. And the high distinction of human nature is that in its constitution it is a union of the two worlds of spirit and matter, a reflection of spiritual intelligences in the material creation. The immaterial principle is the soul or psuche as connected with matter through the body, and the spirit or pneuma as connected with the higher world. There is in the original record a clear statement as to the two elements of human nature. Man derives his name from the word earth, one of the constituents of which his body was formed: yatsar connected with adamah earth. 2 But this was not as yet, though it afterwards became, a name of humiliation, for the inbreathing of life or lives gave him his essential dignity; this Adam, or Man, the person and the nature he represented, became a living soul, lnepesh chayaah. 3 Though the same word is used concerning other creatures, which have the abortive rudiments of intellectual life, it is here used with a special emphasis. His name is Man, from the earth; his nature is that he is a living soul, which is also an immortal spirit. But it must be remembered that the two substances are distinct. The Bible confirms the instinctive belief in the difference between mind and matter: the unsearchable mystery of the nature of the union between soul and body, and the secret of the action of the one on the other, or rather of their mutual action, are left unsolved. Whether the term soul or the term spirit be used, there is throughout Scripture the most emphatic testimony to the unity and dignity of the higher element of human nature. This Dichotomy is quite consistent with a certain measure of truth in the theory of Trichotomy which separates between soul and spirit. It will hereafter be seen that St.

Paul adopts that distinction for practical purposes: when he does so, the soul and spirit are distinguished as one the immaterial principle in relation to the world of sense and the other in relation to a world of spiritual realities; just as the flesh as the material and the body as the organization are distinguished when occasion demands.

1 Job 32:8; 2 Genesis 2:7; 3 Genesis 2:7. THE IMAGE OF GOD IN MAN. The Image of God is made the first note and attribute of human nature: the first revealed truth concerning our race declares the peculiarity of man as a new thing in creation to be this, that he should bear in himself the likeness of his Creator. It was the Divine purpose, spoken before the creating fiat was executed, that this should be his distinction from every other creature. Hence this image must belong to his inmost creaturely constitution. As such it was Essential and Indestructible: the self-conscious and self-determining personality of man, as a spirit bearing the stamp of likeness to God and capable of immortality, was the reflection in the creature of the Divine nature. While all creatures up to man reflect the perfections of their Creator, it is man's distinction, made emphatic in the act of his creation, that he alone should bear His image. This therefore is the ground of his dignity, and, while that dignity belongs to his nature as a whole, it necessarily is found in that part of his nature which is not material, and therefore imperishable. From beginning to end the holy record regards this image as uneffaced and ineffaceable, and still existing in every human being. But it also speaks of the renewal or restoration of that image in its moral lineaments. There is a sense then in which it was also Accidental and Amissible: the free spirit of man reflected the Divine holiness in a perfect conformity of mind, feeling, and will, which was lost through sin: not utterly lost only because redemption intervened. The Image of God was, according to the sacred narrative, concreated in man: it was in his nature, and no part of it was super-added after his creation. Finally, as the Eternal Son is, in the supremest sense, Himself the Image of God, Adam as the representative of mankind was created in or after that Image. And, thus in his creation related to the Second Person of the Trinity, he was also united to the Triune by the gift of the Holy Ghost, that breath of God which gave him life eternal.

1. It is usual to distinguish between the Natural or permanent and the Moral or accidental image of God in man; it must be remembered, however, that the moral image in a true sense was also natural, and that in the creation there could be no distinction. But the distinction between the image that was indestructible and that which might be lost has an unqualified and necessary truth. It lies in the very notion of a created free personality: the freedom of the created spirit is the purest reflection of the Divine nature, but that same freedom involves the possibility of its excellence being lost. That which is its highest glory contains the secret of the possibility of its deepest degradation. Theology cannot take a second step unless this is admitted in its full force.

2. The distinction runs through the entire fabric of Scripture. It is in the New Testament, however, that we find the elements of the complete doctrine on this subject as on every other connected with the original and the restored condition of mankind. It speaks of the renewal of the regenerate into the image of the Creator as that consisted in Original Righteousness, or the moral image. The two cardinal passages which must regulate our views are in the Epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians. In the former the Apostle speaks of believers as having put on the new man, which is renewed (or in process of renewal) unto knowledge after the image of Him that created him. 1 In the latter the description becomes an exhortation: be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness. 2 These

passages must be united and carefully compared, as they supplement each other.

They both distinguish between the first creation and the second in Christ, between the ktísantos and the ananeoústhai. The latter verb refers to the restoration of what the former describes as originally given but lost. Both passages make the knowledge of God—that is, the spiritual knowledge of God—the object of the restoration. This the latter and more amplified passage unfolds as righteousness and holiness: the first man knew the Creator's law, his will was conformed to it, and he was righteous in principle; he knew the Creator's holiness, loved Him as holy, and was holy himself in principle. Thus the moral image of the Creator lost in the Fall is restored through the putting on of the same image as presented in Jesus Christ, the eternal Image of God manifested in human nature. Each of the passages speaks of putting off the old man, which is the fallen and corrupt nature as derived from Adam. In the former, the process is regarded as gradual; in the latter, the new image was stamped upon the soul in its regeneration. But the second passage adds what the former omits, that the Holy Spirit Who was the conservator of the holy image in Paradise is the agent of its renewal in redemption: be renewed in the Spirit, the seat of whose working is in the mind. Hence the New Testament never speaks of a renewal of the Divine image in man's nature as he is man: only in his fallen nature. The indestructible image is in both Testaments always referred to as existing still in man universal. Men which are made after the similitude of God 3 is the language of St. James. And St. Paul, referring to the heathen, and quoting the testimony of their own poets with approval, For we are also his offspring, 4 goes on most expressly to argue from the likeness of the children of men to their Creator that their thoughts of God ought to be altogether spiritual: rebuking idolatry as contrary to the instinct of the Divine image within us. So, also, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews asserts with the utmost generality that God is The Father of spirits. 5 And this is in harmony with the Old Testament. After the Flood there is a most impressive remembrance of the abiding and permanent dignity of the chastised race. The waters had not washed away the original image; nor was it created anew in those who were saved. No clearer evidence of the indestructibility of the Divine likeness could be given than that of the sanction thrown around human life; it is inviolate, for in the image of God made HeMan 1:6 Of course this does not decide the question whether or not immortality was part of the indestructible image, though it might seem that we affirm it by using the term indestructible. We are told by St. Paul, in one of the few passages which speak of athanasía, that it is God Who only hath immortality, 7 but He Who is the life hath given to man in His Son to have life in himself.

1 Colossians 3:10; 2 Ephesians 4:23-24; 3 James 3:9; 4 Acts 17:28; 5 Hebrews 12:9; 6 Genesis 9:6; 7 1 Timothy 6:16.

3. It is of great importance to remember that whatever is meant by the image of God was at once concreated in man. In the Middle Ages a distinction was established between the Image and the Likeness, between the two Hebrew terms btsalmeenuw and kidmuwteenuw. This was formulated by the catechism of the Council of Trent thus: Tum originalis justitiae donum addidit. The doctrine of Rome is that immunity from concupiscence or victory over it was a supernatural and added gift, like immortality; that over and above his " pura naturalia" there was a righteousness in which Adam was " constitutus." Hence all that he lost or could lose was the gift of his original righteousness, which left the natural conflict between flesh and spirit without the restraint of the added gift. Man has still all that in which he was created as such. The effect of this view will be hereafter seen when we reach the doctrine of Original Sin. Meanwhile, it is sufficient now to assert

the Scriptural doctrine that whatever belonged to his likeness to God was stamped upon man in his original character: he received both the image and its superscription.

4. The doctrine of this Divine image is carried to its highest point, and beyond the Old Testament record, when it is connected with the Eternal Son as the original, absolute, archetypal Image of God. This description of the Second Person in the Trinity is next to that of Son the most common in the New Testament: it almost becomes a proper name.

He is the eikoón toú Theoú, 1 the IMAGE or GOD, as the outbeaming of all the Divine glories and the full expression of the Divine nature towards the creature, regarded as possible or as actual. In the image of that Image was man created. Both in his first and in his second creation the Son was the archetype and pattern. It was this specific relation of the Son that made it possible, becoming, and appropriate, that He should be the Redeemer of the fallen race: a truth that may be pondered profitably, if it is not perverted into the doubtful notion of a necessary incarnation, apart from sin, of the Second Person.

1 2 Corinthians 4:4.

5. But this doctrine is incomplete without the addition of the supernatural gift of the Holy Ghost: if that may be called supernatural which belonged to the union of God with this His Elect Creature. The Holy Trinity must be connected with every stage of the history of mankind. As the Protoplast was formed in the image of the eternal Image—a son of God,1 after the likeness of the ONLY-BEGOTTEN SON—so he was under the spiritual and natural government of the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son. He Who brooded over the chaos, presided over all the successive dispensations of life in its advancing stages towards perfection, and was the supreme life inbreathed into the highest creature, took full possession of that new creature. He did not add the moral image, but He guided the principles of action of man's soul created in that image. This solves the difficulty sometimes expressed as to the creation of a character which, it is said, must of necessity be formed by him who bears it. Man was led of the Spirit, 2 Who was the power of love in his soul, already in his first estate as now in his last estate. How long this holy discipline lasted we are not given to know; but we do know that the Fall was its departure as a free and perfect education. This explains also the wonderful endowments of Adam, who reasoned and formed his language, and understood and gave names to his fellowcreatures below him. The LORD GOD of the garden was the Holy Ghost in the human soul. The Spirit in man's spirit must not, however, be confounded with the image of God as such: the gift was distinct, but the true complement and perfection of every other gift. This is, as will be afterwards seen, the secret of the trichotomy of body, soul, and spirit in human nature.

1 Luke 3:38; 2 Galatians 5:18.

6. From all this it appears that the expression Image of God, in relation to the original constitution of Adam, is a very broad one. A few particulars are not enough for its statement. It includes the whole sum of man's dignity and prerogative, and it brings all that belongs to God into some relation with this His highest reflection in the creature.

There is nothing Divine that is not reflected in some most wonderful sense: the Holy Trinity, and all the Attributes, in the unity of light and love. THE NATURAL AND FEDERAL UNITY OF THE RACE.

Adam was created as the head of a race, to descend from him by natural generation. He represented that race in his supremacy over the lower world; as also in his subjection to a probationary law. Thus he was, in a certain sense, both the natural and the federal head of mankind: in him both the natural and the spiritual development and destiny of the human species were decided.

1. As one of the laws of man's combination of spirit and matter, he propagates his species in the integrity of its individual members. Adam begat a son in his own likeness, after his image. 1 This sentence, following on the account of the creation, and connected with it, proves that there were not two or more simultaneous creations of man, or creative centers: the lines of Cain, Abel, and Seth meet in Adam. It shows also that immediate creation, as in the case of angels, was no longer the law. It seems to favor what is known as the theory of Traducianism, the propagation of the entire being of man by natural generation; though it does not preclude the theory of Creationism, which regards the individual spirit as in every case created by God, the Father of spirits. 2 Both theories must be in a certain sense true, but the secret of their unity is past our finding out The doctrine of the Pre-existence of human souls, which, after a fall in a supersensible state, were sent for punishment, trial, or expiation, into human bodies, is altogether contrary to the record of Genesis.

1 Genesis 5:3; 2 Hebrews 12:9.

2. The human race in Adam was invested with supreme prerogatives over the lower creation. The first man was the representative of God upon earth. It yielded its secrets to his knowledge, its fruits sprang from his cultivation, and its inhabitants were consigned to his government. It is difficult now to estimate the dignity of this prerogative: it was not the image itself, but was its necessary consequence. Much of the miseries of our race is due to its forfeiture. The history of science and civilization is the history of the struggles of mankind to repair the loss. The remembrance of it as a vanished estate and the anticipation of its return unite in the poetry of the nations. The poetry of the Bible finds the same expression in Psalms 8:1-9, specially as touching the past; and the Epistle to the Hebrews expatiates upon it in reference to the future, 1 when the second Head of mankind shall restore to the race what it has lost.

1 Hebrews 2:8 3. The first man was in a certain sense the federal representative of his race as placed in a state or condition of trial with two sides of a tremendous alternative before him.

Hereafter we must consider this more fully: suffice now that the record in Genesis, interpreted by St. Paul to the Romans, represents the dealings of God with our first parents as regarding their posterity in them. Adam was in a state of probation, and man was in a state of probation: that is, the garden was a scene of test to the whole estate of mankind. The failure of man was foreseen; but it was permitted, because of the new creation and new probation which a second Adam would introduce: here is the profoundest problem of our origin and destiny. With all this, however, we have not yet to do. Enough that the entire human race was as one organic unity represented in Adam, even as it was as one organic unity represented by Christ. If one died for all, then were all dead or all died: 1 this is equally true of the first and of the Second Adam.

1 1 Corinthians 15:14.

4. It might seem as if God, in the creation of man, took account of his coming fall and decreed redemption. The dust was ready to receive him when he returned to his earth, and the spirit to return to the God Who gave it. In the New Testament St. Paul tells us that the first man is of the earth, earthy, 1 and that in him the natural body was given to man; adding further that the Second Man is of heaven, and became a life-giving Spirit, whereas Adam became a living soul. The comparison of Genesis with St. Paul's comment shows that there was a development of being, as it were, purposed and suspended in Adam: that he was to have enjoyed immortality through the gradual or sudden spiritualization of his bodily frame; but that it required the Last Adam to come to accomplish the design of creation. Through the Fall, the first Adam became to us all the father of a dying nature: he bereft himself and us of the quickening Spirit Who would have rendered the resurrection needless. But this glance into the coming mystery of the Cross is anticipating.

1 1 Corinthians 15:45-49.

HUMAN HYPOTHESES. This Divine account of man's origin displaces every other devised by man's science.

Accepting the testimony, as we believe it, of the Creator Himself, we have only to stand on the defensive. " Neganti incumbit probatio." And it may safely be said that no other hypothesis of the production of mankind has yet proved its case. Those which deny the general principles, of creation have been already considered, as also those which have given other accounts of the origin of our race. One thing it settles definitively: that it has not been produced by any development of the principle of life in matter, whether the theory takes its earliest rude form that man is terrigena, autochthon, a production of the soil, or the scientific evolutional form of later days; that his history has not been a gradual ascent from the savage state, but that the savage condition is a descent from his original; and that he was created in one type, the representative of a single species. The slightest doubt on any of these points is inconsistent, not only with the subsequent matter of theology, but with the primitive record, the only one we possess, of the creation of mankind. According to the principle we adopt, and must adopt, it is not directly necessary to examine the hypotheses of scientific Anthropology; for science has no generally accepted hypothesis which fundamentally contradicts Scripture. On all the points just mentioned, and especially the unity of the race, the best representatives of science are on our own side. THE ORIGIN OF MAN.

Speculations as to the Origin of Man upon the earth have been more or less bound up with those on the origination of life generally. Antiquity had its vague theories, half poetry, half science, of the necessary evolution of all forms of life from the soil. Men were autochthones, terrigenae, born of the earth. The Pantheism of every age has held the same idea, but dignified it by the supposition of an internal source of life which moulds matter into forms innumerable, and that of man among the rest: assuming its highest known immaterial expression in the human subject. Materialism inverts the process, and makes man an organism in which matter exhibits its perfection in the phenomena of thought and conscious personality. Modern speculations on this subject differ generally from the ancient, in consequence of their being constructed on a theory that does not necessarily exclude a personal God, the origin of all life. Placing Him at the ultimate point where life originated, they regard the evolution of all the forms of life as the operation of forces impressed upon matter, or constituting matter itself: some making the long time up to man, and his high

intelligence, a continuous advance of nature upon itself, naturally selecting and making permanent its best types; others regarding the original law as having provided for a series of leaps from species to species: but all, whether they intend it or not, practically denying the creation of the human soul or spirit as a substance distinct from matter. It is impossible so to state the theory of evolution as to preserve the integrity of the higher element in man's nature. But the true theory of that nature requires that something was superadded to the physical and immaterial life that lay behind it in the history of the creation. The Scriptural account is plain and express: man was created in the image of God. 1 This was the formal character of his nature as new in the Divine economy: and modern science will never find rest until it is acknowledged.

1 Genesis 1:27.

UNITY OF THE RACE. The UNITY of the race, or the human species, is a subject which brings much modern science into collision with Scripture.

1. The holy record declares that the species of man is one, and that it sprang from one common ancestor: Adam being the personal name of the first man, and the generic name of mankind. This truth is the common foundation of the doctrines of sin and redemption. By one man sin entered Mo the world; 1 and death the consequence of that has passed upon all men. There was no other centre of the same species: God hath made of one blood all nations of men. 2 Christ is the Son of Man; and He the One died for all the entire history of Revelation, and the whole economy of human development as that of sin and recovery from sin, is based on this assumption.

1 Romans 5:12; 2 Acts 17:26.

2. No results of modern science disprove, or even render doubtful, this truth. On the contrary, evidences converge from all quarters to confirm it. Whatever criteria are applied to test the unity of species—whether physiological or psychological—the human subject sustains. And the history of the race furnishes a multitude of corroborations. In two lines especially, those of language and religion, the argument, if argument it may be called, gathers its endless materials. Comparative philology and comparative theology, the science of language and the science of religion, both throw wonderful light upon the past of mankind; but upon no truth does that light fall more brightly than upon the unity of the human race. Meanwhile, the sacred record gives a clear account both of the central unity and of the manifold diversity of the languages of men; both of the fundamental unity and endless variations of their religious beliefs.

ANTIQUITY OF MAN. The antiquity of man on the earth is simply a chronological question. Christ came at the end of the world 1 and in the fullness of the time; 2 but over how long a series of ages the preparations for His corning extended is not expressly declared. Provided the unity of the race be maintained, the length of its past continuance on earth is a subordinate matter. If longer, it only enlarges the number of the Redeemer's subjects, though of course it deepens the mystery of His long delay. Whatever is now, however, or may hereafter be, absolutely proved as to the antiquity of the human species in this world, Christian theology is prepared to receive. But it is impossible to forget that with this question is bound up a congeries of hypotheses most degrading to the dignity of our race as such, and most perilous to the doctrine of its unity. This chronological inquiry takes several forms. One weighs the evidence derived from the early remains of mankind; another estimates the time requisite for the gradual formation of their various race distinctions. And the

question remains whether the chronology of the Bible, so far as it contains a chronology, meets the reasonable demands of the results of both investigations.

1 Hebrews 9:26; 2 Galatians 4:4.

1. It cannot be denied that the tendency of modern scientific opinion is in favor of a very long past history of the race of man upon earth. But it is equally undeniable that the induction of evidence is of the most precarious character; that its elements are not only composite, but mutually inconsistent; and that all the value it has is bound up with the assumption that man began his history at the first remove from the mere animal life. The most substantial evidence would, of course, be the discovery of human remains—whether the bones of man or his instruments— in juxtaposition with those of extinct races of animals. But that evidence is contradicted by some of the best observers: geology has no peremptory law for the rate of deposition, on the one hand; and, on the other, the methods of accounting for the collocation of human remains in connection with other remains in caverns are not exhausted. Moreover, the inferences defeat themselves. They require, for example, at least a hundred thousand years for the existence of man on the earth; but the known laws of population would account for the present numbers of the race in six or seven thousand years; while, on the other hand, even supposing him to have risen from a state of savagism, there is no reasonable account to be given of his remaining sostationary during so many tens of thousands of historical years. Linguistic arguments are equally precarious. Languages without a literature change very swiftly. As to the requirements of ethnological variety, we have no means of judging how soon the early varieties would receive from surrounding circumstances their final impress: under our own eyes a very few generations suffice to produce great changes and make them permanent. But we must take higher ground. We doubt not that in due time scientific researches will answer many of the scruples of science; and the Holy Record gives us reason to believe that many special interpositions of Providence account for much that we cannot quite harmonies. Though the God of creation rested, the God of providence worketh hitherto; and we do not know all the secrets of man’s gradual descent to the present term of his life, of the Flood, of the extraordinary impress upon the second originals of the race, the phenomena of Babel, and the dispersion of the nations.

2. The received chronology of our earliest sacred books is not rigorous. Estimates perfectly orthodox have added to the commonly received term of the duration of human life upon earth a sufficient number of centuries to allow time enough for all race and linguistic variations. The question has theological interest only as affecting the truth of Scripture; and, before the Scriptural chronology is attacked, both friends and foes must agree as to what it teaches. But it is no disparagement to the Old Testament to say that we have not yet a certain key to its dates. That they do not harmonies with Egyptian, and Chinese, and Indian chronology is of no importance: no reliance can be placed upon the latter, when they go back beyond about three millennia B.C. But the laws of reckoning generations in the Book of Genesis are not clearly determined; nor on what principles we are to reconcile the Hebrew original and the Septuagint, which latter allows nearly two thousand years more. The genealogies for the most part mark the descent, and not always the regular succession. Hence there are multitudes of estimates given by Jewish and Christian chronologists of the period elapsing between Adam and Christ. The longest of them would allow all the latitude we need. THE ELEMENTS OF HUMAN NATURE.

1. Discussions have never been wanting as to the constituents of human nature. The early Christian Church inherited the ancient philosophical Trichotomy, as expounded by Plato. The soul was regarded as the principle of animal life, common to man and the lower orders, and the spirit as added by the Divine inbreathing to be man's special prerogative: whether as a new substance or a new qualification of the soul was never determined. But this distinction, which is adopted for practical purposes by St. Paul, was perverted to heretical ends. The Gnostics taught that the spirit in man was an emanation from the essence of God, and therefore incapable of being defiled by matter: thus undermining the true doctrine of the fall, and the very foundation of redemption. Apollinaris availed himself of it to rob the person of Christ of the human spirit: the Lord's sensitive soul being a sufficient vehicle for the Divine Logos. In later times the doctrine of original sin was embarrassed by this distinction: a theory was very prevalent, and still is, which limited the transmission of sinful bias to the sensitive nature only. Hence the healthier tone of Christian teaching, especially in the West, found it needful to hold fast the Dichotomy of human nature: body and soul, flesh and spirit, being interchangeable expressions for the dual nature of man. It will be obvious, however, to those who weigh well the utterances of Scripture, that, provided the original constituent elements of human nature are only two, the whole religious history of man requires a certain distinction between soul and spirit: his one personality being connected by his soul with the world of sense, and by his spirit with the world of faith. Yet soul and spirit make up one person.

2. There is a modern theology, orthodox in all other respects, which assumes that the spirit in man is the prerogative of the regenerate only: an attempt to reconcile the two theories which Scripture does not sanction. It is true that in the Old Testament the terms lnepesh chayaah and Wnishmat, answering to psuche, soul, and pneuma, spirit, are used both of men and animals; but in the fuller revelation certainly the pneuma is never given to the beast, and never denied to man. Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth? 1 is a question which would be put in the New Testament into different terms. The Ego of man is now pre-eminently the spirit, inasmuch as that is the sphere in which the Holy Spirit dwells pre-eminently; but it must not be forgotten that the person of man is below and behind all these: the body, and soul, and spirit are his as a personality embracing all.

It is true also that St. Paul says that the first man, Adam, became a living soul; the Last Adam became a life-giving Spirit. 2 But the Apostle speaks here only with reference to the resurrection; and leaves out of view the fact, that the first man was in another sense also made a possessor of the quickening Spirit. Most certainly when the personality of man is crowned in regeneration with the Holy Ghost fully restored his soul becomes, in a sense in which it was not before, the Godward principle in his compound nature.

1 Ecclesiastes 3:21; 2 2 Cor. 15:45.

3. Adam was generic humanity as well as the personal Adam: that name in the Hebrew never knows inflection. Scripture uses no such abstract term as human nature; though St. James speaks of every fúsis of beasts that hath been tamed teé fúsei teé anthroopínee 1 the bestial nature is under the human nature, or mankind. In the ancient discussion between the Realists and Nominalists the question arose whether there is not in the Divine mind, and in human thought reflecting the Divine mind, a reality of human nature, of which every living man is an expression and representative. As there is an abstract theioths, of which the Three Persons are

representatives, so there is a human nature which the Second Person represented in the Incarnation, rather than as becoming a personal individual man.

Granting the truth of this mysterious principle—not the less true because we cannot fathom it—every man descended of Adam presents his own personal individualization of a generic character impressed by its Creator on mankind; and receives into himself the generic evil of original sin, which is the sin of the race in Adam. But this is anticipating.

1 James 3:7.

12. Vol 02 - Origin of Sin in the Universe and on Earth

Origin of Sin in the Universe and on Earth

SIN.

ORIGIN OF SIN IN THE UNIVERSE AND ON EARTH IN THE UNIVERSE: the Original Sin IN THE WORLD: the Fall of Man interpretation of the Narrative

Theories The Probation and Fall Fall Active and Passive THEORIES OF ORIGIN AND NATURE OF SIN Dualism or Necessary Principle of Evil Finite Limitation

Sensuous Nature Free Personality THE discussion of Providence has exhibited Sin, the destruction of which was the object of the redeeming counsel, as contemplated from eternity in connection with the origin, development, and destiny of mankind. It is therefore as a doctrine interwoven with all the subsequent stages of theology, being in fact one centre from which the whole may be viewed. But it has its own range of independent topics, making it a distinct study. We ascend first to the mystery of its Origin, in the universe and on earth, this leading of necessity to the consideration of its Nature in itself and of the Theories devised to account for it: then follows the relation between Sin and Redemption, or rather the mitigating effect that the coming redemption throws back upon the evolution of evil; thus introducing, finally, its universality in mankind, or Original Sin, the sin adhering to the race as such and to every member of it naturally born into the world From hamartia, the general New-Testament denomination of sin as subjective or in the soul, has been derived the term HAMARHOLOGY, occasionally used for this entire department. It appears in some systems as PONEROLOGY, from ponhron or ponhria, which indicates rather the objective character of sin or evil in its manifold relations and consequences. It is useful to note these terms, though they are not much used in English theology THE ORIGIN OF SIN By a necessity of thought we commence with the origin of sin. The sacred record declares that it began in the universe with the fall of free intelligences, failing in their probation: and that it began on earth with the disobedience of our first parents, which brought them the knowledge of evil as guilt and as punishment uniting in death. The history of the first transgression, whether of angels or of men, is so presented in Scripture as to show that the origination of evil is with the creature itself. Whatever differences there are in the two Falls, and however much of mystery remains in both, they unite in one thing: they preclude every theory that seeks the principle of sin in any other source than the freedom of the spirit created in the Divine image IN THE UNIVERSE The Scriptural account of the origin of sin in the external universe is very brief, but very distinct; and what it lacks is supplied by the fuller history of the fall of mankind. One Original Sinner is indicated, who was the cause of sin to his fellows, and the instrument of its introduction into this world

1. The absolute beginning of evil, and of sin as the cause of evil, is directly traced to the fall of the Devil and those who are called his angels. Satan is the representative of evil as it had its beginning in him. There are passages of Scripture which in a marked manner make him the father of all iniquity. It is true that many of these refer to his connection with sin in this world: for instance,

the testimony that he was a murderer from the beginning, 1 which sends us to the history of the human Fall. He was the instrumental cause of death to the first man; and therefore in one sense first in the transgression, 2 behind Eve who was first in another sense. But there are some which intimate darkly that the first spirit separated from God was his. Our Lord, who came into the world as the Antagonist of the evil one, gave His disciples on a memorable occasion a single hint of large meaning: I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven. 3 While we must understand these words as condensing into one flash of revelation the whole history of the conflict with the powers of darkness, so far as it concerns this earth, we must also regard them as giving testimony to the fact of the primal fall of one intelligence, so essentially the first and most prominent that he stands for the whole company who followed him. He was the head of those angels who kept not their first estate, 4 of those angels that sinned. 5 Of him our Lord, who knew what was in devils as well as what is in man, said: he abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. 6 This absolute negation of any element of truth in Satan is made more emphatically positive: when he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it. The lie is here essential evil, the denial of the truth of a creature's relation to God: he is the father of the universal lie, the father of evil and sin. And this is made more probable by the allusions to the Devil and his angels, 7 as comprising all the beings for whom final and irreversible judgment waits, having been prepared 8 for them alone. Always there is assigned to one Power a pre-eminence over a multitude of others who owed their sin to him: not, however, through the inheritance of a propagated bias to evil, but by each one independently yielding to his temptation or following his example. On this subject we can say but little; suffice, that the Devil is both directly and indirectly regarded as the Prince or archon of iniquity in the universe as well as in this world. His was the original sin; it was the misuse of freedom; it was the mysterious birth in his nature of an ambition to rival God, or the Son of God, an ambition which was transferred to this world after his exclusion from heaven; it was imitated by many others; it was irreparable, at least we hear of no redemption or hope; and, lastly, it was the fountain of temptation to our race 1 John 8:44; 2 1 Timothy 2:14; 3 Luke 10:18 : 4 Jude 1:6; 5 2 Peter 2:4; 6 John 8:44; 7 Matthew 25:41; 8 Jude 1:6

2. Of Satan's relation to other worlds we know nothing. But the introduction of evil into the world of mankind, and its history through all our generations, are in a special manner bound up with his first apostasy, the Original Sin. The link between the pride which caused his ruin and the transgression of our first parents, was this: ye shall be as gods!1 Our sin is, so to speak, a reflection or continuation of his. Hence he retains his empire and headship as the lord and representative of the principle of evil. He has set up a kingdom of which he and not Adam is the head. Of this more hereafter; for the present it will be enough to enumerate the names of the original sinner, whose relation to the lapse of mankind is his aggravated condemnation, but not the excuse of human depravity. (1) As the representative of evil or sin in itself he is called That Wicked One, 2 absolutely; and of the propagation of all the innumerable seeds of sin it is said: the enemy that sowed them is the Devil 3 (2) As the representative and lord of the empire of sin, he is the God of this world, 4 the Prince of this world,5 the Prince of the power of the air, 6 the Spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience; 6 a collocation which places him in solemn antithesis to the Persons of the Holy Trinity respectively, the first with the Father, the second with the Son, and the third with the Holy Ghost; especially when his kingdom 7 is taken into the account. (3) As the representative of the spirit of enmity to goodness he is Satan, or the Adversary, the Devil, and the Tempter. 8 (4) The tenor of the New Testament makes him generally the embodiment of sin: its

origin, lord, promoter, witness, and executioner. Always and everywhere he and his angels are real persons: the personality of no agents is more expressly revealed or spoken of in terms less liable to misapprehension But this question enters here indirectly 1Genesis 3:1; 21 John 3:12; 3 Mat. 8:39; 4 2 Corinthians 4:4; 5 John 14:30; 6 Ephesians 2:2; 7 Matthew 12:26; 8 Job 1:6 THE FALL OF MANKIND The Mosaic account of the Probation and Fall of the First Pair is an inspired narrative of the origin of sin in the human race; it is not a collection of early traditions or myths; nor an allegorical method of teaching the moral history of sin in man; nor a combination of history, allegory, and legend; but an historical narrative of facts, which, however, are bound up with symbols that must have their interpretation as such. In that interpretation the utmost caution is necessary. But no exposition can pretend to solve every difficulty, or obviate every objection; because in our estate of sin we have no experience of the original condition of our first parents, and therefore have not the key to the solution of the mystery of their temptation and subjection to evil. The brief account records that man was placed in a state of trial, with the consciousness of the possibility of sin or separation of his will from the Divine will; it describes the circumstances and the nature, external and internal, of the temptation from without; and it sets before us the preliminaries, the act, and the immediate consequences of the first transgression or what in our human annals is the Fall of Man THE NARRATIVE The Record gives its account of the ruin of mankind as history; that of a beginning which flows on without break into the subsequent course of redemption. As a narrative of simple facts it is seldom alluded to in either Testament; but such allusions as we find assume its historical reality. Our Lord gives His sanction to the account of the creation, quoting its very words, and indirectly including the Fall itself. St. Paul again and again refers to the incidents as recorded in Genesis. The history is tacitly recognized as history—primitive, fragmentary, Oriental, it may be, and deeply symbolical, but Divine—throughout the sacred oracles

I. The few references in Scripture are very explicit. The more carefully they are observed, in their context, the more obvious will it be that the account of the first transgression must be received in its simplicity, with its commingled facts and symbols, by all who hold sacred the authority of our Lord and His Apostles 1. In the Old Testament there are few undeniable allusions to the circumstances of the Fall. We read in Job: if I covered my transgressions as Adam, by hiding mine iniquity in my bosom. 1 To conceal iniquity is after the manner of men, but there appears to be a marked reference to the colloquy between Adam and his Maker. A passage in Hosea has been often quoted in favor of the Paradisaical covenant of works: but they, like Adam, have transgressed the covenant. 2 This however may be, and is, translated, like men Throughout the older economy Adam is merged in his posterity; and the fall of mankind, like the sin which caused it, is everywhere assumed as a postulate. The Old Testament is not constantly laying again the foundation, rather it may be said to cease to speak of the first principles 3 of its doctrine. Hence, as in the two passages quoted above, man is Adam, and Adam is man 1 Job 31:33; 2 Hosea 6:7; 3 Hebrews 6:1

2. In the Gospels there is literally not one express allusion to the narrative of the first catastrophe. It needed not our Lord’s corroboration and therefore did not receive it. But if we weigh well His words, on the question of divorce, we must conclude that the whole record has His supreme sanction as historical. Have ye not read that He which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to

his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? 1 They, who read this as history read as history what immediately follows; and the Redeemer's declarations, already quoted, concerning the murderer from the beginning, 2 refer obviously to the very narrative of Genesis 1 Matthew 19:4-5; 2 John 8:44

3. St. Paul, who inherited the later Jewish doctrine, and gave much of it Christian sanction, more than once confirms the literal texture of our narrative. So must we interpret his words, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety; 1 where he means Satan, who was and is transformed into an angel of light 2 instead of creeping on the earth. So also his prophecy and prayer, the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet, 3 which is an echo of the first promise given to man through the condemnation of the Devil. Here it may be observed, in passing, that the Apostle by the use of the term transformed gives us the only solution we need of the difficulty of temptation through the voice of a serpent. St. Paul, moreover, as we shall see, founds his argument of Original Sin on the literal narrative of the Fall 1 2 Corinthians 9:3; 2 2 Corinthians 9:14; 3 Romans 16:20

4. The comparative reserve of the rest of Scripture as to the facts and symbols of the narrative is broken through in the last book. The Apocalypse returns back to Genesis, and quotes almost every particular in such a manner as at once to sanction the literalness of the account and to relieve it of some of its difficulties. The final promise to the first Church of the Seven is: to him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God. 1 Here the literal Eden of man, and the literal tree from which he was excluded, reappear in their heavenly significance; but the spiritual, which is afterward, implies the reality of the natural which was first. The doom upon Satan has also its spiritual and eternal meaning: and the great Dragon was cast down, the old serpent, called the Devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world. 2 His seduction of our first parents is merged in his universal temptation from the Fall downwards; but the tremendous reality of the conflict between him and the Seed of the Woman through all the ages of redemption is based upon, it flows from, the first literal triumph permitted of God. The light of the apocalyptic glory shines through all intervening ages up to the darkened paradise of the Fall, not relieving it of its impenetrable mystery, but confirming its literal truth. It bids us study the narrative in the spirit of simple faith: leaving to God Himself the vindication of His righteous judgments and unsearchable ways, and rejoicing only that the leaves of the Tree of Life are for the healing of the nations, and that there shall be no more curse 3 to those who enter the heavenly Paradise 1 Revelation 2:7; 2 Revelation 12:9; 3 Revelation 22:2-3

II. The two theories of interpretation termed Mythical and Allegorical are really one; with this important difference, however, that the former denies the Divine authority which the latter admits or does not exclude

1. The Mythical theory appeals to the universal traditions of Paradise and the Golden Age, the unhistorical character of the Serpent, the trees, the walking of God in the evening, and other features of the detail, as all indicating a legendary origin. It is said that the Hebrew narrative is only one tribal version of an idea common among the early nations. We accept the truth that underlies this false theory. The traditions of many nations contain mythical accounts which have been woven out of the threads of a primitive tradition; but they declare their legendary character on the surface. There is no Myth in the Bible, as has been already shown; and the traditions of the early

history of the world recorded in Genesis are in no way connected with any particular people. They profess to have been revealed to the first writer of the Biblical documents; and are incorporated into Scripture as such. They belong to the archives of the race, and not of any one family in it: Divine Tradition before all human traditions

2. The Allegorical method of explaining this first chapter of human history has been adopted by the mystical school, from Philo, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Origen downwards, through Maimonides, to modern times. It admits the Divine origin of the Mosaic account of the introduction of sin; and supposes that the whole scene is figurative, representing by a continuous allegory the facts of the Fall, but having no more connection with those facts than the allegory of the Vine brought out of Egypt had with the redemption of Israel. Now it is undeniable that the essential meaning of the whole narrative may be extracted from it on this principle, as may be seen in some of the best expositions of the Alexandrian school. But this canon of interpretation is repudiated, as will be seen, by the clear and unclouded testimony of later Scripture, as well as by the strict literality of the style of the opening chapter of Genesis in general. Fact and Parable are Divinely interwoven

3. The purely historical character of the narrative may be maintained in perfect consistency with a full acknowledgment of the large element of symbolism in it. It must be remembered that the scene of Paradise, though introduced into human history, belongs to an order of events very different from anything that human experience knows or can rightly appreciate

While the narrative is true, and every circumstance in it real, there is not a feature of the Paradisaical history of man that is purely natural, as we now understand the term. The process of human probation, whether longer or shorter, was supernaturally conducted by symbols, the deep meaning of which we know now only in part, though our first parents perhaps understood them by express teaching. The garden enclosed; the sacramental Tree of Life, the nourishment of conditional immortality; the mystical Tree of Knowledge, the fruit of which would reveal the profound secret of freedom; the one positive precept, representing the whole law; the symbolical serpent-form of the Tempter; the character of the threatenings and their fulfillment on all the parties; the exclusion from the garden, and the flaming defenses of the forfeited Eden; all were emblems as well as facts, which almost without exception recur at the close of revelation in their new and higher symbolic meaning. Both in Genesis and in Revelation they are symbols or signs with a deep spiritual significance. The remembrance of this serves two purposes. It suggests that our first parents were bound to their Creator by a religion which made all things around them sacramental, and some things more especially such. And it protects the simple details of the Garden from the contempt of unbelievers, who see in them nothing but what appears on the surface of the narrative. The water of baptism and the eucharistic bread and wine are slight and common things in relation to the amazing realities they signify. But the infidel spirit finds nothing in these symbols to object against as such. Then why should it be thought a thing incredible that the two trees of Paradise should have borne sacramental fruit? (2.) This leads to the consideration that the history of the Fall is described to us with constant reference to the coining redemption: it is the first chapter in the history of man, but of man as redeemed. The whole requires to be read in the light of the great salvation even then ready to be revealed. The penalty of death not at once executed; the expulsion from Eden with a prophecy of future deliverance; the Providential conditions under which the transgressors are sent forth into the world, all indicate that the narrative of the Fall and the end of the first probation is really the narrative of the beginning of the Gospel

and the second probation of mankind

(3.) Once more, this record describes the Fall in terms taken, so to speak, from man's later history. What form commandment would assume to the mind of an unfallen creature, what the idea of the alternative in good and evil would be, how temptation would address itself to the will which had never yet been in a state of rebellion or vacillation, we cannot understand; for these things are not revealed. The posture of the pure spirit in a state of probation and on the verge of falling, but hitherto unconscious of sin, is a secret lost to us: no mortal has since the Fall been in such a posture; nor will ever be, since temptation will not belong to our future heaven. The same inability to apprehend and state the truth applies to the history of the scene in our Lord's temptation. With regard to the temptation of both the first and the second Adam the record adopts the language known to man as a sinner. In the case of the sinless and impeccable Redeemer, His indwelling Divinity, or rather His essential and not merely indwelling Divinity, was an infinite safeguard against His undergoing what is of the essence of probationary temptation. But the language used concerning His more than fiery trial adopts the terms with which our sin has made us familiar. He was tested, and declared to be the Son of God with power according to the Spirit of holiness, 1 thus to apply St. Paul's words. It was manifested through this ordeal that He was sinless and incapable of sin; just as it was proved in Gethsemane that no pressure upon His spirit could make it waver in the will of God. The hour of His highest honor on the Mount of Transfiguration was His temptation also, in the sense of trial. He was searched through and through by the glory of the Father and declared to be the Beloved Son, in whom, though He was that night anew consecrated to the cross, God was well pleased. But the temptation of our Lord is always spoken of in the same terms which would be used concerning a holy one among ourselves. Unless we bear the same thing in mind in reading the account of the first human trial all will be most perplexing. There was no evil concupiscence in man's nature; but the woman is addressed as if it were latent in her and might be excited. The meaning of God's words in the threatening is discussed by the Tempter before Eve as if she had been accustomed to compare truth and falsehood, and deduce the inferences of suspicion. The process of first admitting the possibility of the Divine word being untrue and His commandment not good, and then of consulting the appetite and its decision as to the desirableness of the tree, and then of actually taking the fruit, are all described after the manner of ordinary human temptation. So also is the immediate sense of guilt and shame. So also is the suggestion to Adam, and his yielding to the seduction of his temptress. The whole process could not be described as it actually took place in the minds of our sinless first parents: the phraseology is derived from our later guilty experience. We are taught in the only way in which we could be made to understand what it concerns us to know; and must submit to the limitations of our fallen faculties

1 Romans 1:4 THE ORIGINAL PROBATION

Nothing is said concerning the degree of knowledge imparted to Adam and Eve as to the nature, terms, and limits of their probationary estate. The record is very simple: containing only such a bare outline as it pleased God to communicate to the infancy of the world. But the fact of PROBATION is as plain as words can make it. Placed in the garden to dress it and to keep it as the centre of cultivation that might overspread the world, Adam, and the human race in him, was on his trial. He represented his posterity; but not as a mediator between God and them; and therefore the ordinance of probation had not the nature of a covenant. The so-called COVENANT

OF WORKS has no place in the history of Paradise. It cannot be thought that moral creatures introduced into existence are dealt with as parties to a covenant: the covenant idea belongs to a different order of things, and requires a mediator. Our first parents were simply placed under the law of their Creator, and the penalty of disobedience made known to them. The counterpart of this, the establishment in a fixed and consummate eternal life, may be regarded as reserved in the Divine counsel The circumstances of the Probation were a positive commandment with its sanction, and temptation from without: both appealing to a will consciously free or unrestrained, and as yet under the direction of a reason on which the law or obligation of obedience was supernaturally written

1. The one absolute law had a negative and a positive form, as connected with the two symbolical trees of the garden: the Tree of Life and the Tree of Knowledge. The eating of the one was a positive condition of continued life and every benefit of creation; abstinence from the other was the negative condition. It must not be supposed that the trees had any inherent virtue: the one to sustain life for ever; the other to poison and corrupt the nature of man. The solemn eating of the fruit of the tree of life was only a sacrament of immortality; it was to the eating of every tree of the garden 1 what the Christian Supper is to all other food. The fatal eating of the tree of knowledge was only the outward and visible sign of a sin which, by the Divine law inwrought in human nature, would have been followed by shame and guilt and fear had no such tree existed Through eating its fruit man came to the actual knowledge of good and evil, to the knowledge of his misery: a knowledge which made him acquainted with his own power over his destiny—as if he were his own god—and at the same time taught him that this power, independent of God, was his ruin

1 Genesis 2:16

2. Temptation from without was more than symbolized by the instrument—fallen now like the real tempter himself from its first estate—of that old serpent, called the Devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world. 1 The distinctness of this record is of great importance. It establishes a difference between the original sin of earth and the original sin of the universe. We need not, indeed, assume that the angels who fell were only tempted from within: there is every reason to think that, as through envy of the Devil came death into the world, so through the same envy, excited by another Object in heaven, death entered among the angels. It cannot be that sin should have its origin within the spirit of a creature of God independently of solicitation from without. But, in the case of man, the agency of Satan is made prominent from the beginning of Scripture to the end: not as reducing the guilt of the first transgression, but as mitigating its punishment, and suggesting at least a difference put between sinful angels arid the human race 1 Revelation 12:9

3. As to the conduct of the first assault we have a very clear account, so far as it was external: the internal element of the temptation is not referred to, nor is the mysterious beginning of sin, the point where temptation finds, because it creates, something to lay hold on. In other words, the origin of sin in the as yet uncorrupt nature of man, like the origin of evil in the as yet uncorrupt universe, finds no solution in the revelation of God. How the pure desire of knowledge became the lust of independent forbidden knowledge, how the natural sensibility of the soul to the enjoyment of the Tree could become evil concupiscence, is not told. We are shut up to the solemn fact THE FALL The Fall into sin was internal and external; the sin first of the human spirit and then of the human flesh. Hence it may be further viewed as a voluntary or active, and as a passive or judicial,

degradation from the high estate in which man was created I. The original lapse was at once both internal and external

1. Separation from the Supreme Will was consummated within before it was exhibited in act. The inmost principle of sin is the severance of the self from God: the entertainment, therefore, of the question Yea, hath God said? 1 was the beginning of human evil. This was the first Formal Sin, though not alluded to in Scripture as such. The outward act was the look of concupiscence towards the tree, which had in itself the guilt of partaking, and was followed by the partaking itself. Hence in all New-Testament references to the original sin its principle of disobedience is made prominent. The woman being beguiled fell into transgression: en parabásei. 2 And when Adam yielded to the enticement of Eve, he only proved that he had already consented to her act; he also fell into transgression His sin was disobedience, paráptooma and parakoeés: for, Adam was not beguiled.3 1 Genesis 3:1; 2 1 Timothy 2:14; 3 Romans 5:15-16

2. Hence the first offence was spiritual and sensuous: these being united inseparably, but, according to the Scriptural account, the sensuous temptation taking the lead in the transgression, though the more spiritual took the lead in the enticement. The Tempter's suggestion appealed to what was highest and to what was lowest in the elements of human nature: to its unbounded capacity of knowledge and to its sensibility of the pleasures of sense. When the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof. 1 It must not, however, be inferred from this that the Fall of man was simply a decline into the slavery of sense. There is no sin that does not begin in the spirit, though it may be made perfect in the flesh. The first sinners rejected the restraint of God's Holy Spirit, and made themselves independent in thought and will, before the fruit of the forbidden tree could become a real temptation. This hidden mystery of iniquity, behind the act of transgression, was only brought to light in the recorded Fall

1 Genesis 3:6

3. The immediate consequences of the lapse into sin are plainly disclosed, though still in a style partly symbolical and figurative. The first effect is described in language with which the inmost experience of men makes them familiar. It was the immediate knowledge of good and evil: 1 the birth of evil conscience, the moral consciousness disturbed by a sense of guilt; the beginning of shame, or the sense of degradation and vileness. This double consciousness was, as it were, a new birth unto unrighteousness: the first realization in experience of the distinction between good and evil, a distinction, however, which had been theoretically made known by revelation to our parents while yet untransgressing, Thus we see the external relations and the internal at once depicted: guilt before their Judge and pollution in His sight. These drove the transgressors from the presence of their Maker, which was the converse of the sentiment of one of their descendants: depart from me, for I am a sinful man, 0 Lord! 2 They fled from God, because God had departed from them. They hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God: 3 not as if they had sunk so low as to think it possible that the trees should hide them, but from the sentiment of spiritual fear. They felt at once that they were, unless the Creator Himself should interpose, for ever separated from Him. Hence we have in the simple record of the effects of the first transgression all the elements of the doctrine of sin. It was the internal deviation of the will from the will of the Supreme; it was objective guilt, the Divine vindication of eternal law in the conscience; it was guilt

subjectively, as the consciousness of personal fault and obligation to punishment; and it was the expression of a sense of separation, for the time of hopeless separation, from the presence of God: the supreme penalty of sin 1 Genesis 3:5; 2 Luke 5:8; 3 Genesis 3:8

II. The term FALL is probably derived from the sublime description of Wisdom and her works in an apocryphal book which contains some other references to the beginning of sin, showing how much the later Jewish theology was occupied with the subject. She preserved the first formed father of the world, that was created alone, and brought him out of his Fall. Here, indeed, the fall is that of the individual first father; but the true instinct of interpretation has always made Adam and mankind one, and therefore adopted the expression FALL OF MAN. It was the voluntary descent of the human will from its unity with the will of God; it was the consequent degradation of mankind from the high prerogatives belonging to the Divine image in which man was created. Both the active and the passive meaning of the word, as introduced into theological language, must be retained

1. As to the former, a superficial glance at the scene that begins human history in the garden has led many to the conclusion that our first parents were the victims of circumstance; that they were deceived, and unwittingly stumbled; that mighty temptation from without co-operated with the simplicity of their own unformed and undisciplined conscience to ruin them unawares. Bat it must be remembered that the beings whose free personality the Righteous God tested were created upright. Their liberty was perfect: that is, not merely they possessed the faculty of willing or choosing indeterminately, as unconstrained by necessary law from without; but their formal will was filled by its mi object, fixed upon God Himself. The very nature and the terms of the test show that they understood the alternative of good tad evil: they were taught that good was perfect obedience to the Divine will, and that evil—which they knew and yet knew not - was disobedience to that will. Though it was the Enemy who said, Ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil, 1 it was not he who first introduced to the human mind the most tremendous of all alternatives. For God’s warning was, in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die. 2 What other teaching they had we are not informed; but certainly we may conclude that they were not left in ignorance of the relation between the solitary positive precept and the more general unspoken law of their duty as creatures of God Nor do we know what education they had received, nor how long they had received it, from communion with their Maker and the teaching of the Holy Ghost. We only know that on the part both of Eve and of Adam there was a willful revolt against the Almighty; that the act of their will was not simply the abuse of the liberty of indifference—which in their case could not exist—but the actual wresting of it from its determined and rightful Object; that never has human will been more absolute in its working than theirs; that it was, so to speak, the concentrated will of humanity turned from good to evil 1 Genesis 3:5; 2 Genesis 2:17

2. The passive Fall was commensurate with so great an evil. Viewed apart from the Rising Again in Christ, it was a total descent of mankind from its high destination; involving the very earth in its consequences; and deepening the doom of the chief agent of temptation, not omitting the degradation of the subordinate agent which he had employed. Man was no longer the image and glory of God; 1 for, though he retained his human nature inviolate as created in the Divine image, the glory of that image was lost His nature—using that term in its secondary sense as the moral quality of its disposition invariably appearing in every reproduction of the original type—became entirely perverted. Nor was woman any longer the glory of theMan 1:2 in the best sense of that

word: the relation of woman to man was deprived thenceforward of its highest perfection Man fell from his destination: that of an eternal progress from glory to glory in sinless fellowship with his Creator. He declined into a lower sphere: out of communion with heaven, into a life of external discord and internal misery. He lost his intuitive vision of God, no longer held discourse with his Maker through the symbols of nature, and had to begin, he and all that should be his, the very first principles of a spiritual world. But we know not how great was the Fall: after the first words of the Divine displeasure, not another comment is made on the subject. Its further influence on the race, and its mitigation through the universal Atonement is before us, but not immediately. If that Fall was not total, it was because the Redeemer's unseen Hand arrested it. The, Child Jesus, already the new Father and Head of mankind, was even then set for the falling 3 and RISING UP of the human race. More, however, on this brighter aspect of the subject must be reserved for the doctrine of Original Sin 1 1 Corinthians 11:7; 2 1 Corinthians 11:7; 3 Luke 2:34

3. In this fact—the coming redemption, or rather that redemption which was revealed before Paradise, was shut on our first parents—we have the only answer that can be given to the protests which have been honestly or dishonestly urged against the narrative of the Fall. We are not indeed at a loss to vindicate the justice of the Holy God in His deep displeasure at the first offence. But we have not to do with the holiness of God apart from His love. From the beginning mercy glorieth against judgment. 1 The Mediator is already between the Judge and the sinner. And if God's justice turned the first transgressors to destruction 2 when He drove out theMan 1:3 from the Paradise of His presence forfeited by his sin, His mercy is still heard, following hard upon His wrath, Return, ye children of men 1 James 2:13;2 Psalms 90:3; 3 Genesis 3:24 THEORIES OF THE ORIGIN OF SIN

Philosophical speculation propounds various theories to account for the derivation of sin, which, as one of the most universal facts in experience, must have some common cause These theories combine its origin and its nature in one, it being impossible perfectly to separate the two ideas. The most desperate of all expedients boldly assumes an eternal principle of evil, which in its creaturely workings becomes sin. The most specious solution makes what seems to be evil merely the creaturely limitation on its way to perfection. Between these and combining them is the less philosophical theory that makes sin the effect of the residence of the spirit in the flesh of concupiscence. A consideration of these hypotheses will lead to the true cause of sin as given by Scripture, and confirmed by man's common sense, the abuse of the gift of liberty ETERNAL PRINCIPLE OF EVIL The first and most ancient speculations accounted for the existence of sin by assuming a necessary PRINCIPLE OF EVIL in the universe

1. Inherited from the remote east, this notion was held in the Gnostic sects of early Christianity, in Manichaeism, and in certain systems which sprang up in the mediaeval Western Church. Zoroaster (Zarathustra), the real or imaginary founder of the religion of Parsism, about the time of the later Jewish prophets, represented Ormuzd (Ahura-Mazda) as the author of all good and Ahriman (Anra-Mainyus) as the author of all evil in the nature of things. These were independent personal spirits, ruling absolutely each in his own dominion; yet not so absolutely as to be unrelated to each other, since they were in perpetual conflict, and all created beings are called to make choice between them. This ancient speculation struck deep roots in human thought, and reappeared in the Gnostic systems of early Christian times. But in these it was modified. The evil principle became the active agent in the creation of the material universe; he was the Demiurgus

of a matter eternally existing as ulhe, Hyle, the substance of all evil; man was a product of the two kingdoms of light and of darkness: having affinity with the former in his spirit, with the latter in his soul and body. Human sin was the necessary defilement contracted by the spirit from its alliance with matter; and redemption was the deliverance from this bondage. Manes in the third century revived this dogma of Gnosticism, and from him it derived the name of Manichseism: he laid stress however upon this, that these were not two eternal gods, but two eternal principles. In the twelfth century it appeared in the Paulician heresy; and in all ages has had its supporters among those who have rejected Pantheism, and yet have refused to accept the personal God of the Scriptures

2. Whatever form this old theory has assumed, it has paid its unconscious tribute to the truth. If that principle of evil is a Person, as in Persian Dualism, there can be no infinite and eternal God. If it is Hyle or Matter, then its eternity as the material of evil involves a denial of every Divine attribute. The human mind has never found rest in this conception Parsism itself betrayed a tendency to struggle upward to the thought of an eternal essence beyond and above Ormuzd and Ahriman, in which they had their unity and in the process of ages would find their reconciliation. Nor are there wanting traces of the teaching that Ahriman fell like Satan by an act of will. Though these latent protests did not affect the essential Dualism of the whole system, they were silent expressions of the deep conviction of reason, that there is and must be One absolute Being, and that evil, whatever its source may be, is essentially wrong and in conflict with what man surely knows to be right, or, in other words, that sin is the worse eternally opposed to the better Hence, finally, it may be said that there was a certain nobility in this ancient error contrasting favorably with that to which we shall next turn. It admitted that there is an awful reality in sin; it represented man as passing through a tremendous probation; it had a dim and shadowy presentiment of guilt, thus making a great step towards the perfect doctrine of Scripture; and it aspired towards the still grander idea of a full and eternal redemption LIMITATION OFFINITENATURE The necessary LIMITATION OF FINITE NATURE is a popular philosophical expedient for the solution of the mystery. However stated and however limited, this theory must needs make the Author of finite nature the author of sin: either absolutely or as the necessary process of creaturely development towards the supreme good in Himself

1. As held by the various modifications of Pantheism this speculation abolishes sin altogether, and merges it in the general notion of the necessary development of the nature of things. But the nature of things is God Himself, who is at once the one eternal substance and an eternal development in two modes, thought and matter. There is no creature, for all things are the evolution of one substantial Being. What therefore seems to be the finite is only the infinite in phenomenal exhibition. During its transitory appearance it is subject to the metaphysical evil of limitation: the more of being is in the thing undergoing development the nearer it is to perfection; the less of being it has the more it is infected with evil, or what men call sin. But all things are only manifestations of the One; and what seems to us contrary to the will of God is only the process through which the end of return to the infinite essence is reached. Pantheism knows no sin, no moral obligation; it recognizes only an eternal necessity of accomplishing through phases of metaphysical evil the transitory destiny of what man calls the creature 2. But something like this theory has been, held by deep thinkers who are not Pantheists

These fall into two classes: such as make evil a necessary accident of the creature as limited, retaining its character as sin; and such as make it a necessary accident, but at the same time the

Divinely appointed process through which by antagonism good is evolved

(1.) The radical principle of the former class is that sin is merely a negation of being, a quantitative less of the strength of existence. The creature cannot be perfect: its knowledge is liable to error, its will is liable to deviation. And this very liability is metaphysical evil: it cannot be conceived to be protected from the possibility of sin, and the possibility in the severe logic of facts is the sin itself. But that sin is only a negative thing; it has no positive existence, and needs no EFFICIENT cause for its origination. If any cause is needed, a DEFICIENT cause may be invented for the purpose. This philosophical expedient, it may be observed, was much countenanced by Augustine and others of the earlier Fathers; it is the strength of the Theodicy of Leibnitz; and both in ancient and modern times has been resorted to for the vindication of the Divine character in the permission of evil

(2.) Many modern writers have dwelt much on a theory which accounts for sin on the principle of a necessary antagonism, or the operation of a universal law of action and reaction. As life and death, light and darkness, attraction and repulsion, the centripetal and centrifugal energies of the universe, are opposites which in their interaction make the perfection of things, so virtue and vice, evil and goodness are opposites which cannot be separated in our estimate of probation. The Eternal purposed that there should be a knowledge of good and evil: of good as the survival in the contest with evil. There is no virtue but as the victory over vice; no goodness but as the victory over evil. The pilgrim to this Jerusalem must needs go through Samaria: it is the order of Providence that all creatures shall find their way thus to Himself. This is a theory which simply adopts into the moral domain the physical principle of evolution. It is one which has much fascination for superficial speculatists who do not examine the eternal principles of religion in their own nature, and who are content to renounce the plain teaching of the Word of God. The sentimental notion that human development cannot be conceived save as a process through evil to perfection, is disproved outside of our race by the angels who fell not, and within it by the Sinless Redeemer of mankind

(3.) Whatever form these schemes assume they either abolish sin altogether as such, or they make God its Author. From this dilemma they cannot escape. It is true that many who have maintained these views have found in them a refuge for minds weary of the desperate struggle with the anomaly of evil in the universe of a holy and almighty Creator. But they have only given additional evidence that such a struggle was not appointed for the finite faculties of man. God does not sanction, nor does He bless, the attempt to pry into this mystery. It is true also that these theories—apart from their pretension to solve the mystery of evil—contain many elements of truth. The possibility of sin and error is most assuredly an attribute of the creature as such, and human freedom is the secret of human error; but metaphysical imperfection is not necessarily moral evil, and the negative evil of being imperfect is not the germ of sin. Undoubtedly, since the Fall, and presupposing that the antagonism of good and evil works out through the discipline of grace the highest perfection of the creature, it may be that the conflict with sin will issue in a kind of holiness and knowledge of God unknown to the unfallen. But the Father of spirits can never, by the Christian thinker, be supposed to have created intelligent creatures under the law of a necessary imperfection in which evil is bound up

SENSUOUSNATURE

Another theory combines the two former, at least in some of their elements; it derives human evil from the SENSUOUS NATURE of man, and makes it the antagonism between the flesh and the spirit, the ascendancy of the former over the latter explaining both the origin and the nature of all sin

1. This hypothesis has assumed many forms, and reigned very extensively in Christian speculation. It suggests a Gnostic origin, so far as it seems to regard matter as the seat and source of sin; but differs from Gnosticism in making the ascendancy of the flesh question of personal and free choice. It enters into all the systems which regard evil as a necessary stage of the development of a free intelligence; but differs from those already spoken of in this, that it makes the flesh only the accidental instrument through which the inherent weakness of the higher powers is shown. In the mediaeval doctrine, which took its final form in the Tridentine dogmas, the lower nature was regarded as being restrained by the supernatural gift of righteousness, the withdrawal of which released and set in operation the concupiscence of the flesh. The most elaborate exposition of this theory is that of Schleiermacher, who sets the God-consciousness in man over against the selfconsciousness as related to the world. In the Divine purpose the flesh, or the consciousness of self in the world, was by development to be brought into perfect submission to the God-consciousness. This development was hindered by the Fall; and the knowledge of failure in it is the sense of guilt or sin. In Christ, the Ideal Man, Who presents the reality of what human nature never reached apart from Him, the Godconsciousness is perfectly ascendant; and becomes so in us through communion with Him. It is obvious that in this nebulous system we may trace, beneath a cloud of words, the elements of all the errors already mentioned. The general theory takes a more rational form in those writers who speak of sin as simply the result of a surrender of the will at the first dawn of conscious responsibility to the dominion of the objects of sense which solicit it at the very threshold of life and thus have the advantage of the first appeal. All these modifications, however, agree in the fundamental principle that in some way or other the sensuous or fleshly nature of man is the source and occasion of evil

2. The refutation of this superficial solution involves the doc-trine of Original Sin, Postponing, therefore, any more full examination of it—which indeed that doctrine will render need-less—we may make a few remarks, especially on its appeal to the sanction of Scripture. An examination of the various forms which the contrast of flesh and spirit assumes will show that nowhere is sin, even by implication, assigned to the flesh as its seat, much less as the secret of its origin

(1.) The flesh is opposed to the spirit in man—the sarx to the pneuma—just as we distinguish the body as the organ of the soul! connected with the outer world, and the spirit which holds communion with invisible realities. In our present estate, the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak; 1 but both the weakness of the flesh and the inability of the spirit to overcome its weakness are alike the result of sin. St. Paul speaks of that same weak spirit as itself in bondage to the law of sin which is in my members. 2 It is true that he lays emphasis on the sin that dwelleth in me, that is, in my flesh; 3 but the indwelling evil cannot be the same as the tabernacle in which it dwells. So the BODY of sin is the body of SIN; 4 not that the fleshly body is the sin, but its instrument only. There is no support in this class of passages for the notion that the flesh is only the prison house of a spirit, holy in itself, though fettered to a body of sin and death 1 Matthew 26:41; 2 Romans 7:23; 3 Romans 7:17-18; 4 Romans 6:6

(2.) But the flesh and the Spirit are also contrasted; and in this case the flesh signifies the nature of man, his entire nature, as fallen from God. Though the sins of the lower part of his constitution give the name, spiritual sins are included: the works of the flesh 1 include vices which are wholly independent of the body; and ally the human transgressor with the unclean spirits who can have no fleshly lusts. When therefore St. Paul distinguishes between the carnal man, as sarkinos, and the spiritual man, as pneumatikois, 2 he is referring respectively to him whose whole nature is under the sway of sin and to him whose whole nature is under the sway of the Holy Ghost. The Divine Spirit possesses the whole man, but inhabits his spirit especially; and through His sanctifying grace the whole spirit and soul and body 3 of the believer is made sinless, and preserved blameless. The superficial view of sin, therefore, which makes it the triumph of the lower portion of man over the higher, the sense over the reason, has no support in these passages. It is directly discountenanced and condemned by them 1 Galatians 5:19; 2 1 Corinthians 3:1; 3 1 Thessalonians 5:23

(3.) Lastly, the flesh is the designation of mankind as subjected to vanity, weakness, and decay and death. He also is flesh 1 is the first testimony to this, and throughout the Scriptures the infirmity of man's whole estate is thus marked: all flesh is as grass. 2 But this is the effect and not the cause of human sin. The Lord Who received power over all flesh, 3 was first made flesh 4 Himself. And this very fact for ever disproves the notion that in this is the necessary seat and source of sin. Jesus Christ is come in the flesh 5 was St. John's witness against Gnosticism in every form; and in Him is no sin. 6 After this we need no further witnesses. It may be said, indeed, that the flesh, as assumed by our Lord, was preserved by His indwelling Deity from the uprising of its evil; emphasis being laid on His coming only in the likeness of sinful flesh. 7 But we must remember that He condemned sin in the flesh, and restored it to its original freedom from evil as our first father possessed' it. He was manifested in the flesh to take away our sins; 8 and to vindicate, for Himself and for us, the sanctity of the flesh as it was made the tabernacle of the human spirit 1 Genesis 6:3; 2 1 Peter 1:24; 3 John 17:2; 4 John 1:14; 5 1 John 4:2; 6 1 John 3:5; 7 Romans 8:3; 8 1 John 3:5

ABUSE OFFREEDOM The only theory that remains—if it may be called a theory— is that which seeks the cause of evil in the abuse of the freedom of the will. Of every phenomenon we ask the cause; and it is impossible to avoid asking the cause of this the worst of all phenomena. But causes are variously defined as originating, efficient, formal, instrumental and final. Of evil we dare not ask the originating cause, save as it passes into the efficient; and that is the will of the created spirit. The formal cause, which makes evil to be evil, is the abuse of the freedom of that will separating itself from God. An instrumental cause there could not be, in the case of the original sin of the universe. As to the final cause we must not speak save to quote tremblingly our Savior's words, spoken on the only occasion when the permission of evil was proposed to Him as a problem, that the works of God should be made manifest.1

1 John 9:3

1. The ORIGIN OF EVIL in its ultimate and final cause—its absolute beginning and its purposed end—can never be matter of theory, or even conjecture. It is a secret which is not revealed, not probably ever to be revealed. It has excited human speculation from age to age only to baffle it. The genesis or birth of evil, whether physical or moral, is a MYSTERY OF INIQUITY: of that there

can be no question to any sound mind. But how the first little cloud in the holy universe arose which has covered the heavens and overspread the earth, and why evil was permitted to enter and go no more out for ever, we may ask, but there is none to answer. It is the dignity of our created nature that we may struggle with the problem; it is equally the necessary limitation of our created nature that we are overpowered by it

2. But when we study sin in ourselves as the subject of it we may at least arrange the elements of our ignorance, and analyze the mystery which we cannot solve. In our human participation of the great calamity we have an instrumental cause, the temptation introduced from without. But that temptation found no element of sin, though it found the possibility of it, in human nature. As yet Satan came and had nothing in man. The insoluble mystery remains among the secret things of the Divine counsel; like the general fact of probation itself, a mystery which underlies all the rest. The origin of all sin, and therefore of all evil, which in one sense includes sin and in another springs from it, is to be sought in the FREEDOM of the created will. Conscious freedom in the origination of action, and the choice of the end of action, whether ultimate or subordinate, belongs to the PERSONALITY of our spirit stamped with the image of God. The Divine law in the creation of intelligent moral beings seems to be that they must voluntarily make the supreme end of life their own by a free self-determination; that, after a longer or shorter test, this freedom should become a necessity of nature; and perfection be found—whether by the operation of some spiritual law within, or by the vision of God without—in the relative bondage to good which is perfect freedom: the highest idea we can form of resemblance to our Creator. Thus that likeness of God which is the note of our highest dignity involved the possibility of our deepest degradation. But when we are finally created anew in the image of the Son to which we are predestinated to be conformed, 1 probation will have ceased, and our freedom will be the necessity of goodness, like that of God. Himself

1 Romans 8:29

13. Vol 02 - Nature of Sin

Nature of Sin

NATURE OF SIN Self-Separation from God

Guilt Consciousness of Sin and of Obligation to Punishment

Death Spiritual Physical. Eternal

Sin, having been considered in its origin as matter of revelation and faith, may now be viewed as matter of experience in its nature and development. Here we are shut up to the definitions of Scripture, generally given in a variety of names by which sin is characterized. These names, which are few but distinct and clear, describe it in two ways First, with reference to God, it is the voluntary separation of the human will from the Divine, expressed in disobedience to His law. Secondly, in relation to man, it is guilt, as the consciousness of personal wrong and personal liability to punishment. It will be found that all the revelations of the Word of God concerning sin as such, and apart from its peculiar aspect as original sin, or the sin of the race, may be reduced to these simple elements SELF-SEPARATION FROM GOD The essence of that mystery in the created spirit which we call sin is its voluntary separation from God: that is and must be the root and reality of all evil in the creature

1. It may be questioned whether any Scriptural term expressly indicates this ultimate secret, behind the act of disobedience to law imposed. But more than one of them seem to point towards it. Thus shataatiy and won, sin and iniquity, united in the iniquity of my sin, 1 both signify deflection from the true aim: the former rather denoting the missing of the mark, the latter the perverse-ness in aiming wrong. So the leading Greek term amartia means also the missing of the mark, with the idea of deviation from it, as is seen in amartein, intransitively to become separate, and thus to fail of its object. Still, the primary and fundamental quality of sin, that it is voluntary separation from God, is not absolutely expressed; it is everywhere implied as the hidden fountain of all the rivers that make sad the life of man

1 Psalms 32:5

2. Almost every definition of sin in the Scripture marks it as transgression of law. It is enough to refer to St. John’s first epistle, which contains the profoundest doctrine of sin and redemption: hee hamartía estín hee anomía, sin is lawlessness or breach of law. 1 How fearful sin is, as the darkness which is not in God, the Apostle has shown at the outset; but here at the end we have his only express definition, and with it the Scripture closes. A great variety both of Hebrew and of Greek terms unite in this central idea, that sin is departing from the prescribed way of duty, the disobedience to express commandment: as Cicero says, Peccare est tanquam lineas transilire. St. John’s definition is important, as showing the difference between the act of transgression and the state of transgression. The words mean that the act is the result of the state, and the state also the result of the act Sin is only the act of a primitive transgressing will, but that will forms the character

behind the future will, and shapes its ends. This final statement of St. John may be divided into its two branches, each of which will shed light upon the general terminology of Scripture. Sin is the voluntary separation of the soul from God: this implies the setting up of the law of self actively, and passively the surrender to internal confusion

1 1 John 3:4

(1.) Though the essence of sin is not selfishness, that is its, first manifestation. Self is set up in the place of God; it is anomia, lawlessness in principle, having thrown off the Divine restraint; parabasis, transgression in act; adikia, iniquity; amartia, deviation from the way or end appointed of God, regarded both as an act and as a state; asebeia, godlessness. While some of these terms are negative, expressing the deflection of the will from its harmony with that of the Supreme, Whose nature and will are one, either or both being the ground of eternal moral obligation to the creature, they still describe sin as the positive condition of the soul: not indeed as any real entity within it, but as the active direction of the will. In the Old Testament this positive element is very prominent. In paasha sin is active lawlessness or willful transgression, as in the words of Job: for he addeth rebellion unto his sin. 1 It is revolt against rightful authority: they have . .trespassed against My law. 2 In raa'at or ra', which is one of the earliest terms, we have the ideas both of perverseness and of universal evil: and God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth. 3 There are some other words which include the thought of a violent revolt against Divine authority. By shgeeniy this is connected with wandering from God; probably it occurs in one of the earliest and most solemn accounts of the effect of sin: in their wandering they are flesh. 4 It may be said that the great mass of the definitions in both the Old and the New Testaments stamp it as the active uprising of the human will against the ordinances of Divine law written either on the heart or in positive statutes 1 Job 34:37; 2 Hosea 8:1; 3 Genesis 6:5; 4 Genesis 6:3

(2.) It may be doubted, however, whether in the Old or in the New Testament there is any one term for sin which expresses its activity as a principle, without a side reference to its privative character and the ruin which it involves. Such terms as epithumias, lust in concupiscence, echthra eis Theon, enmity against God, and ta eauton zeeton, seeking one's own, seem only positive and active; but they regard sin under special aspects, and certainly include its internal perversion. Though its energy as the root of human evil is all but unbounded, it is an energy in evil which is also the misuse of faculties created for good alone. Hence, sin is in Scripture inward confusion, discord, disease, wretchedness, vanity: especially, as will hereafter be seen, in the habitual use of sarx or flesh to express both the vanity and the sinfulness of human nature. The term poneria, evil, itself testifies to the labor and wearisomeness and vanity of sin, as it is related to ponos, labor. In the Old Testament a considerable number of words express the same characteristic of conscious turbulence, disorder, and unrest. Such are aamaal: they conceive MISCHIEF 1 (or vexation) and bring forth vanity; aawen, evil or depravity, as the result of wrongdoing; resha', wickedness, pointing to its restless activity whether as internal or as affecting others: the wicked are like the troubled sea when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt; there is no peace, saith my God, to the WICKED; 2 eeyn indicating the nothingness or vanity of sin: he that soweth iniquity shall reap VANITY; 3 and they that plow iniquity and sow wickedness reap the same. 4 These words do not exhaust the catalogue of terms which define the quality of sin as substituting for the obedience of the Divine law a state of internal anarchy, as throwing the whole soul into confusion, as creating disturbance around, and ending in vanity and wretchedness both physical and spiritual

1 Job 15:35; 2 Isaiah 57:20-21; 3 Proverbs 22:8; 4 Job 4:8 CONSCIOUSNESS OF GUILT

Viewed more particularly with regard to its effect upon man's relation to God's law sin is guilt, or the human consciousness of a Divine imputation: first, the consciousness of PERSONAL responsibility for the sin as committed by self; and, secondly, the consciousness of personal RESPONSIBILITY for the sin, as an obligation to punishment on account of it. These two inseparable attendants on the act of transgression are in reality one; but may be conveniently distinguished

I. How truly the idea of Guilt is distinct and unique may be seen in the language by which it is expressed in Scripture, first, with reference to the Divine imputation of sin, and, secondly, in the human echo of that imputation in conscience

1. The universal testimony of the Bible, from the first revelation of sin down to the last revelation of redemption from it, declares that the Holy Lawgiver imputes man's evil to man as its author; and will reckon to him the violation of the law and the dishonor done to the majesty of His own holiness. The evil that is in the natural world—that is, what evil has been brought into it by the Fall—He reckons only indirectly to the human transgressor, but his sin He reckons directly to him. There is no THOU more direct than that which excited in the two first sinners the sentiment of guilt: Adam, where art thou? 1 Because THOU hast done this, thou art cursed! Because thou hast done it: here is guilt in the sense of CULPA or fault. Thou art cursed: here is guilt in the sense of REATUS or penalty. That sin is guilt in both these senses, and that guilt in both these senses is sin, the Old Testament teaches in its entire doctrine of expiation. Offence against God passes not away with the act, it clings still to the transgressor, and can never be put away from him save by his rendering satisfaction. That satisfaction he can render only by the endurance of the penalty: either in his own person or through the intermediation of other satisfaction counted as his own. He must carry the burden of his sin with him, or bear his iniquity. 2 There is one word, ashaamow which, as connected with chataatow, expresses constantly the idea of guilt attaching to every sin. Although in many passages it has a limited sense, designating the trespass-offering appointed to be brought for offences committed through error, negligence or ignorance, yet that very limitation serves to impress all the more significantly the deep meaning of guilt as such. The trespass-offering, or, as it should be rendered, the guilt-offering, was itself guilt as the representative of guilt: it was ASHAM; and so in the supreme Offering our Lord was made sin for us. 3 It is enough to refer to one text, which may stand for a large number. If a soul sin, and commit any of these things which are forbidden to be done by the commandments of the Lord; though he wist it not, yet is he GUILTY (PECCATI REUS), and shall bear his iniquity; and he shall bring a ram without blemish out of the flock, with thy estimation, for a trespass-offering, unto the priest: and the priest shall make an atonement for him concerning his ignorance wherein he erred and wist it not, and it shall be forgiven him. It is a trespass-offering: he hath certainly trespassed against the Lord. 4 Here we discern distinction in guilt — as the Vulgate translates, juxta mensuram aestimationemque peccati, — in relation to the theocratic laws of the old covenant. But the underlying trespass, the heart and root of all offences, is the same. Hence when we pass into the New Testament, which makes sin exceeding sinful 5 in the light of the finished Atonement, the distinction is done away. The sin-offering and the trespass-offering are united in the One Sacrifice for sins. 6 The highest conception of guilt is that of man's hupódikos géneetai toó Theoó —that all the world may become guilty before God. 7 Though there is a sense in which the Gospel still

marks the sin of him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, 8 and makes a difference between that servant which knew his Lord's will 9 and him that knew not, between the debtor who owed five hundred pence and the debtor who owed fifty, 10 yet all sin is debt, for which satisfaction must be made. The new covenant has introduced this new, term, and teaches the exaction of the uttermost farthing: 11 teaching it all the more rigorously because the secret of a full satisfaction and a frank forgiveness is at hand. The wrath of God is revealed from heaven; 12 and the guilty are children of wrath. 13 The law accompanies the Gospel, and makes the offender in one point guilty of all, 14 pántoon énochos, or, in our Lord's language, guilty or in danger of eternal sin. 15 Hence this phrase, which expresses the New-Testament idea of guilt most emphatically, includes the two meanings with which we set out: personal guilt as breaking the law, and personal obligation to endure its punishment: pántoon énochos and énochos Thanaton. These last words suggest the most affecting illustration of the distinction. We are guilty in both senses: our Holy Savior was only guilty of death. 16 all is expressed in our word SIN; according to its most probable derivation from the Latin SONS, nocens, that which is the guilty cause of death to the soul

1 Genesis 3:9; Genesis 3:14; 2 Leviticus 5:1; 3 2 Corinthians 5:21; 4 Leviticus 5:17-19; 5 Romans 7:13; 6 Hebrews 10:12; 7 Romans 3:19; 8 James 4:17; 9 Luke 12:47-48; 10 Luke 7:41; 11 Matthew 5:26; 12 Romans 1:18; 13 Ephesians 2:3; 14 James 2:10; 15 Mark 3:29; 16 Matthew 26:66

2. The Conscience in man bears its own clear testimony. This faculty of our nature, or representative of the Judge in our personality, is simply in relation to sin the registrar of its guilt. It is the moral consciousness, rather of instinct than of reflection, though also of both, faithfully assuming the personal responsibility of the sin and anticipating its consequences. Such is the Scriptural meaning of the word. It is not the standard of right and wrong set up in the moral nature. St. Paul speaks of that as written in the heart of universal man: the Gentiles show the work of the law written in their hearts. 1 He goes on to speak of their conscience also bearing witness, by its accusing or else excusing, undoubtedly looking upward to a Judge and forward to a judgment. What St. Paul calls suneideéseoos, St. John calls kardia, meaning however, not the heart, in which St. Paul seats the law, but the consciousness of the inner man. The conscience is the self of the personality, in universal humanity never excusing, but always accusing, and is the conscience of sins. 2 But of this we need not speak further now. It is enough to establish the distinction between the standard of right and wrong which may be defective and is not conscience proper, and that moral consciousness which infallibly unites the fault and its consequences in the consciousness of the sinner 1 Romans 2:15; 2 Hebrews 10:2 GUILT AS FAULT AND PUNISHMENT

We may now look more particularly at the idea of guilt under its two aspects: observing, however, preliminarily that what is here said has reference only to sin generally, without including those modifications of its phenomena and degrees of its guiltiness which are concerned rather with the doctrine of Original Sin THE PERSONAL FAULT

Guilt is the personal consciousness of being responsible for the wrong: the transgressor violating the commands of the law acknowledges the law and its rights against himself

1. This is the sense of the forensic term aitia: the sinner is and knows himself to be the agent and the cause of his own sin. Hence it is defined as reatus culpae; or guilt in respect to its fault. The

eternal alliance of sin and guilt in human consciousness cannot be too deeply pondered. This consciousness refutes all those theories of the origination of sin to which reference has been made: it exonerates God; it honors the law; while it does not excuse the Tempter, it lays not upon him as the instrument the guilt of which it assumes the responsibility. In this conscience of sin the devils tremble. This is the deepest secret in the heart of every human transgressor: the mouth may deny it, not knowing what it says; but the inner man is true to its moral instinct The first evasion of guilt was only an evasion; and it was Adam's guilt that said, The woman whom Thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat. 1 This was the knowledge of evil which had been threatened, and the very attempt to transfer the guilt of self to secondary agents was proof that evil was known. Job represents all men when he speaks of the self-deception of covering sin with a covering not of the sanctuary: If I covered my transgressions, as Adam, by hiding mine iniquity in my bosom. 2 When Eve said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat, 3 it was her guilt that spoke. The English term Guilt has affinity with the term Beguiled, but with a far deeper meaning 1 Genesis 3:12; 2 Job 31:33; 3 Genesis 3:13

2. This sure and unerring consciousness of wrong speaks in conscience; but conscience maybe suppressed, may speak inarticulately, or may be perverted in its decisions. The whole economy of law is designed to revive it, to restore it to its sobriety, and constrain it to give its clear witness against self. The sinner takes his first step towards return to God when he acknowledges himself inseparably identified with his past transgression, and owns that himself and his sin are one. St. Paul's words, making out of his own experience an example, are very clear: I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died: 1 I DIED. When afterwards he might seem to cover his sin like Adam, Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me, 2 he does not impute to sin as another agent the guilt due to himself. He only speaks as one who was no longer under the absolute bondage of sin, no longer insensible to its enormity, but struggling to get free. No more I only means that his better self, still guilty—O wretched man that I am! —Was striving, though as yet in vain, to be free: the evil which I would not THAT I DO. But at present we are only considering the conscience of sin awakened by the conviction of the Spirit: the results of that awakening are in the future 1 Romans 7:9; 2 Romans 7:17; Romans 7:24 THE PUNISHMENT

Guilt has another meaning. It is the sure obligation to punishment; or what is sometimes called the reatus poenae. We must remember that it is here regarded as absolute, without reference to any atoning provision; that it is the penalty of a living soul, and not annihilation: and that it is the penalty of the human spirit informing a human body. The soul that sinneth is GUILTY OF DEATH, or of being sundered from the Holy Spirit of life: the death of the spirit separated from God, involving the separation of soul and body, and in its issue eternal. This is a hard saying, taken alone; but its mitigation will come in due time

I. SPIRITUAL DEATH is the departure of the Holy Spirit as the bond of union between God and every living soul. Through His withdrawal the spirits, whether of angels or of men, are separated from fellowship with God, retaining the natural elements of His image, but no longer reflecting His holiness. This penalty we are now considering in the abstract, and without reference to its character as affected by redemption. It is enough to say that in itself it is the departure of the life of the soul as the soul was created to exist in God This is not only the penalty of sin, but also gives it a specific nature, and leads to those manifestations of it which are the best and only definitions of

spiritual death. As by the law is the knowledge of sin 1 positively, so also the absence of the Holy Ghost negatively makes its evil known in all its forms and characters

1 Romans 3:20

1. Instead of the Divine Spirit, SELF becomes the ascendant and ruling principle of the life: the mystery of sin in its origin was the severance of the free spirit from God and the aspiring to become its own god. Now the mystery is revealed: the spirit of man, without the Spirit of God, is surrendered to Self. The life and activity of the self, or selfishness in all its forms, is, whether among angels or among men, the death of the soul. Hence, as will be hereafter seen, the process of recovery from that death is the return of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, when the I no longer lives. If any man will come after me let him deny himself. 1 He that loveth his life doth lose it, and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal. 2 Such sayings point to the principle that true and essential death is the living to self 1 Matthew 16:24; 2 John 12:25

2. According to the original constitution of man the flesh was, in its innocent alliance with the things of sense, subject to his spirit governed by the Divine Spirit: the penalty of sin is the forfeiture of that dominion, as over the outer world generally, so over his own physical nature. Hence the FLESH gives one of its prevalent denominations to sin as manifested in man and in this world. The restoration of the Holy Ghost to human nature restores it to spirituality again: to be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life.1 1 Romans 8:6

3. The absence of the Spirit, making the heart of man an interior temple and all nature a temple external, surrenders man to IDOLATRY. He is a being formed for worship; and his instinct, even in its perversion, is that of a creature bowing down to something above himself. We can hardly imagine the lost spirits without this: there may be something corresponding to human idolatry among the fallen intelligences who followed the revolt of the archangel. But, as to man, while self becomes his interior god, the outer world becomes a vast Pantheon. Hence this positive idolatry is also UNGODLINESS, the meaning of which, as the word tells us, is being without the worship of God, and therefore estranged from His holy nature

4. Sin also becomes a governing PRINCIPLE, capable of end-less development. This springs from the great fact that the elements of human nature were constructed for unlimited progress: if not from glory to glory, then from shame to shame. There is a fearful self-generating power in evil, which grows unto more ungodliness. 1 It may not be lawful to say that sin is punished by sin; but most surely spiritual death to good has in it all the fullness of spiritual life to evil. This accounts for the infinite varieties of transgression, from the secret fault known only to God, up to the sin against the Holy Ghost 1 2 Timothy 2:16

5. Lastly, it must be remembered that, whatever sin is, it is the accident of a nature that is not in itself changed. It is only the separation from God; but the soul going out of His presence still bears in its wanderings His image, the natural characteristics of which are not marred by the introduction of any new faculty created for evil alone. There is nothing new introduced into the fibers of our being as human. In other words, sin must be left altogether to the region of tendency and bias of the WILL, as formed by the character and as forming it in return

II. PHYSICAL DEATH is the penalty of human sin: not however in itself, but as connected with death spiritual: connected with it in some sense as resulting from the same deprivation of the Holy

Ghost, Whose indwelling 1 regenerate man is the pledge of the physical resurrection, even as it is the principle of the spirit's resurrection to life. But it is declared to be expressly the penalty of sin in man; who was on its account subjected to the vanity that was the lot of the lower creatures, denied access to the Tree of Life, and surrendered to the dissolution that had already been the natural termination of the existence of the inferior orders of the inhabitants of earth. From the moment of the entrance of sin death reigned, as afterwards in Adam's descendants, so in himself: for death means mortality, and includes all the innumerable evils that introduce it. It must be remembered that we have no experience of this doom as absolutely unrelieved by the Gospel; but here we have only to do with the punishment itself. As the penalty of spiritual death gives new characteristics to sin, so also does the penalty of physical death

It stamps upon it the attributes of impotence and misery; especially, as we have seen, in Old-Testament definitions. To this we must refer again. Meanwhile, it is enough to say that, whatever our first parents may have understood, the sentence pronounced upon their sin could not have been primarily even, certainly not alone, the separation of soul and body. Moreover, physical death in the sense of the annihilation of man's whole physical nature, as he is soul and spirit, is never once alluded to throughout the Scriptures. To die never in the Bible means extinction

1 Romans 8:11 III. DEATH as the doom of sin is of itself necessarily ETERNAL

1. This penalty is now regarded in the abstract, pronounced upon sin as such. It is the separation of the soul from God, looked at apart from redemption, and therefore a sentence in itself unrelieved and unqualified. This dread truth may be viewed negatively and positively. The withdrawal of the Holy Spirit is a penalty which leaves the sinner without the possibility of self-restoration; and in that is everlasting death. But it is also the positive decree of the Righteous Judge Who separates evil for ever from Himself. In harmony with this distinction are certain well-marked definitions of sin in the New Testament. It is enmity against God, 1 and that implies in itself an eternal severance, as in the case of the unredeemed spirits. It is BONDAGE to evil: that is, the free spirit, never losing its power of self-determination, is determined by the presence of the sinful principle to only evil continually. 2 And in the combination of these again lies the element of eternal death. As the favor of God is life, so death is His displeasure; the sense of guilt, uniting the personal responsibility and the apprehension of punishment, is capable of unlimited continuance. And when it is said that the wrath of God abideth on 3 the unbeliever, we need no other account of the penalty of eternal death 1 Romans 8:7; 2 Genesis 6:5; 3 John 3:36

2. As a sentence pronounced upon sin, death was not declared to be eternal in the beginning, nor ever announced as such until the Redeemer brought life and immortality to light. 1 It was a suspended decree, as indeed every part of the sentence was suspended Physical death immediately took effect, but only in its preliminaries: the deceiver spoke half the truth when he said that, in the day they ate of the fruit, the Protoplasts should not surely die. 2 Spiritual death took effect at once, but that also, as we shall see, not without alleviation. That the severance of the soul from God should endure for ever was not pronounced, because the provisions of mercy might reverse that part of the decree. But with those provisions of mercy we have not yet to do. However, when the grace of God bringing salvation to man was fully revealed, it most solemnly supplemented what had been lacking in the primitive denunciation, and unfolded its deep hidden

meaning. It is the Scriptural characteristic of this second death 3 that it is never foreannounced as a threatening sanction, but always predicted as a consequence of impenitent sin: it is not so much declared to be the penalty of guilt as the penalty of redemption rejected. The Gospel to them that are perishing is a savor from death unto death: 4 death spiritual deepening into death eternal 1 2 Timothy 1:10; 2 Genesis 3:4; 3 Revelation 2:11; 4 2 Corinthians 2:15-16

3. But though the sentence of eternal death is bound up with the scheme of recovery, as the sanction of a rejected Gospel, it must be remembered that it is everywhere declared to be the necessary issue of sin as the opposite of all that is called life. Life is nowhere in the Word of God made equivalent to continuance in being: were it so eternal death would be eternal annihilation. Life is communion with God, and its consummation is eternal; death is the end of unrighteousness, and its consummation eternal. For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. 1 Doubtless there are great varieties in the application of the term death, as there are also of the term life; but the applications of the two terms run parallel. Our Lord's words are emphatic: Verily, verily, I say unto you, he, that heareth My word, and believeth on Him that sent Me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation. 2 Here the contrast of life and death eternal is exhibited. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour cometh and now is, when the, dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live. 3 Here it is the contrast of spiritual life and death. Marvel not at this: for the hour cometh in the which all that are in the tombs shall hear His voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good, unto the, resurrection of life, and they that have done ill, unto the resurrection of damnation. 4 Here the physical life is made eternal, and the spiritual is between the two. It is in the light of these sovereign words that the contested passage of St. Paul must be read: as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin. 5 Here physical death is the penalty of sin; but spiritual and eternal death cannot be excluded, as is evident from the context which surrounds this text in the Apostle's great chapter of Sin

It closes with the sentence: that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord. 6 In the earlier part of the chapter which deals with sin generally, before coming to Original Sin, we have four terms that express its whole nature, both in itself and in that penalty of death in its spiritual and its eternal sense from which the Atonement rescues us. Referring expressly to the state in which we were found by redemption, St. Paul calls men generally hamartolois, transgressors of the law in their very nature; asebes, ungodly and cut off from the favor, presence, and service of God; asthenes, without strength, essentially impotent; and, finally, echthros, enemies, the objects of a positive displeasure or wrath of the Supreme which apart from the mediation of Christ will endure for ever. This quaternion of terms must be carried on into the latter part of the chapter where it is shown how the first transgression paved the way for them. In their light sound exposition cannot limit death as the penalty of sin to the death of the body 1 Romans 6:23; 2 John 5:24; 3 John 5:25; 4 John 5:28-29; 5 Romans 5:12; 6 Romans 5:21;

4. But this leads at once to the connection between moral evil and redemption; the consideration of which will clear the path for the doctrine of Original Sin. In interposing the following section we follow the guidance of St. Paul himself, who passes, in turning from his most complete description of sin generally to his most complete account of its relation to our race, over that sacred bridge: we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by Whom we have now received the Atonement. 1

Not only he but every writer of Scripture, as well in the New Testament as in the Old, constantly connects evil with the system of deliverance from it. Sin is always discussed, defined, dwelt upon in all its development and issues, at the foot of the Altar in the old economy, and at the foot of the Cross in the new. It is a fact which has been alluded to already, and will recur hereafter, that many of the Hebrew and Greek terms for sin itself are used also to express the expiation of sin, while in some phrases the bearing of iniquity and its forgiveness are actually one. It is sufficient to quote one instance. In Leviticus it is said: Whosoever curseth his God shall bear his sin, 2 wnaasaa' chet'ow. Of the Servant of God we read, He Himself bare the sin of many, 3 Whuw' cheet'- rabiym naasaa'; this, if compared with the words concerning the scapegoat, to bear upon him all their iniquities to a land not inhabited, 4 shows that the bearing sin was also the bearing it away by atonement. Then we hear the pardoned penitent crying, Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin, 5 W'ataah naasaa'taa `won chataa'tiy of the utmost sin, the perfect propitiation provided for it, and the assured sense of forgiveness, are all signified by the same profound phrase. Passing by this, however, we must impress on our minds the blessed truth that we at least, as sinners of mankind, never need study sin save in the direct light of redemption 1 Romans 5:11; 2 Leviticus 24:15; 3 Isaiah 53:12; 4 Leviticus 16:22; 5 Psalms 32:5

14. Vol 02 - Sin and Redemption

Sin and Redemption SIN AND REDEMPTION No Element of Redemption in Sin Redemption from without Possible

Probable

Certain

Under whatever aspect viewed—whether as to the Being offended or the sinner who offends—there is no principle and no hope of redemption in sin itself. But, on the other hand, there is much both in the nature and in the development of human evil that suggests the possibility, probability, and certainty of a redemption from without. And the fact of this redemption gives a special character to the general doctrine of sin in all its branches

I. Sin has in itself no element of redemption, whether we think of the Divine character which makes sin what it is, or the human spirit in which the principle of evil resides

1. The Divine nature as holy must eternally abhor and can never be reconciled to it. God is of purer eyes than to behold evil, 1 save to condemn and remove it from His presence Man's fallen nature itself bears witness to this; its true instinct is Depart from me, for I am a sinful man! 2 The God of love is a consuming fire 3 to all that is contrary to His purity; and if that consuming fire becomes a saving destruction of evil, that belongs to the mystery of grace, which is not yet in question. But the Holy Being is also a righteous Lawgiver; His nature and His will are in the revelation of the righteous judgment of God,4 not only against the abominable thing itself, but against the soul that doeth evil. 0 wicked man, thou shalt surely die! 5 is an Old-Testament word that finds its New-Testament confirmation: Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them. 6 And here again the universal conscience of man finds that book of the law his own heart, where is written or engraven the sentence which, so far as it knows, is irrevocable. God cannot deny Himself; 7 nor does the human spirit deny Him His eternal opposition to sin. The justice of God Himself does not more faithfully guard His law than it is guarded by the conscience of man. Neither can conscience deny itself

1 Habakkuk 1:13; 2 Luke 5:8; 3 Hebrews 12:29; 4 Romans 2:5; Romans 2:9; 5 Ezekiel 33:8; 6 Galatians 3:10; 7 2 Timothy 2:13

2. Nor has the sinner any power of redemption in himself. He has indeed in every age wrestled with the sin that rests upon him, but in vain: wrestled with it, knowing it to be wrong, and under the unconscious influence of a grace of which he knows not naturally the secret. He has striven to expiate its guilt by an endless variety of sacrifices that have never availed to take away the conscience of sin: he has never been satisfied with the propitiation either of his substitutionary offerings or of his own personal sufferings. His experience has always denied that sin could by its acts or sacrifices or sufferings put away its guilt. He has striven also to redeem himself by the discipline of philosophy and repentance. But equally in vain: he has never even professed to find

holiness in philosophy, or to be capable of a true repentance. The fact that he has always combined these two-— the offerings for expiation and the attempt to mend his own nature—has attested the universal consciousness of our fallen race that both are necessary; the fact of universal failure has proved that in himself the sinner has no help. The altars of expiation in the temples of an unknown God, and the schools of philosophy hard by, were heathen anticipations of the Gospel that unites expiation and renewal, by one provision meeting both the guilt and the defilement of transgression. They were most impressive and affecting as such; but in themselves, and as evidences of the inherent hopelessness of sin, supremely monitory

3. More modern theories, borrowing the light of the Atonement they reject, have argued that Repentance is both expiation and recovery; they have not only appealed to a human instinct that accepts the penitence of an offender, but also to the language of Scripture itself which describes God as always accepting the penitent. Thus they contradict both the propositions which we have been establishing: neither is the nature of God eternally opposed to sin, nor is man's nature incapable of putting it away. As to the former argument, that of the analogy of human tenderness towards repentance, it omits to consider the difference not of degree only but of kind between our offences against each other and our sin against God; it forgets that there is no strict relation of sin but as between the Supreme God and His creature; no human analogy here suffices. As to the latter argument, that Scripture represents our Heavenly Father as always ready to meet His returning prodigal, it neglects to observe that wherever repentance is thus spoken of, an atonement either typical or real is always implied. The parable which brings the Father of spirits and the returning son to a midway place of reconciliation was spoken by Him whose name is the Mediator; His cross is stamped upon it though as yet unseen; and it is recorded in the same Gospel in which the Redeemer says, This cup is the new testament in My blood, which is shed for you. 1 If, in St. Luke's Gospel of free grace, the penitent went down to his house justified, after having only cried, God be merciful to me the sinner! 2 we must remember that his very word hilastheeti savors of the propitiatory sacrifice, that he spoke his contrition in the presence of the altar of atonement, and that he is justified according to the gracious non-imputation of sin which rested upon a satisfaction for human guilt as yet unrevealed. Both arguments fail to remember that man has no power to repent in the fullness of the meaning of the word; and that repentance is the gift of God, procured by the very Atonement that it is made to supersede: the Atonement of Him who was exalted to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins. 3 1 Luke 22:20; 2 Luke 18:13-14; 3 Acts 5:31

II. All this being true, it is obvious also that sin and redemption have been intimately bound up together in the history of man. Sin exists in God's universe elsewhere; but, as it is found running its course upon earth, it gives tokens of a scheme of deliverance possible, probable, and certain

1. This may indeed be said of all evil, that, if a method of abolishing it can be found which shall be consistent with the Divine perfections, making objective atonement to His justice, and allowing His love subjectively to destroy the sin, it will be found by the Divine wisdom. The same instinct of our nature that assures us of the eternal hatefulness of sin to God teaches us that IF IT BE POSSIBLE 1 it will be removed. It may be said that we are arguing here in a circle: that we are supposing the very redemption that we assume to be a priori contemplated as possible. The objection must be accepted; but it strengthens our position, that there is inwrought by some means or other in the human mind a daring trust that for man at least some infinite resource in God is available. The

entire system of revelation tells us that in the internal mystery of the Trinity such a method has been found. And here lies the unutterable preciousness of the doctrine of the Triune Essence. It is difficult to avoid anticipation at this point. The glory of the future Cross already shines upon the chaos of moral disorder. Christ Jesus, the Representative of man in the eternal counsel, if not in His eternal nature, has by His oblation of Himself once offered absorbed the punishment of sin and rendered its utter destruction certain in all those who make His Atonement their own by faith

1 Matthew 26:39

2. We need not complicate the question with the fact that lost spirits are unredeemed: they tempted us to sin but must not tempt our faith to doubt our recovery. Certainly there is nothing in the condition of human nature that shuts out the possibility of redemption Its depravity, taken at the worst, is not a total extinction of every element that grace might lay hold on. In fact, the development of moral evil in the world has such a character as to suggest that man's nature was not found unredeemable, that it has been once the object of a mysterious intervention, and is ever undergoing the discipline of a process of recovery The universal sentiment among men that God may be and in some sense is propitiated; the refusal of human guilt to give up its case as hopeless; the almost impossibility of persuading men generally that their sin is unpardonable; the voice of conscience speaking in every language under heaven, in the accents both of fear and of hope; the irrepressible yearnings after some great Deliverer and some great Deliverance, all proclaim that there may be redemption for man, and confirm the testimony of the Bible that for the face of human transgressors God has found a ransom.1

1 Job 33:24

III. Now the entire doctrine of Sin takes a new aspect from this gracious intervention, from this mystery of atoning love. In how many ways it affects that doctrine as displayed in the scheme of the Gospel we shall hereafter see. Meanwhile, it has this preliminary effect, that it shows us moral evil as the penalty and infection of a race continuing from generation to generation, and counteracted and vanquished as such. But this leads us directly to the doctrine of Original Sin, which marks the special peculiarity of evil in the family of man: at once its universality as surely propagated and the gracious alleviation it receives

15. Vol 02 - Original Sin

Original Sin

ORIGINAL SIN: the Sin of the Race as Redeemed IN RELATION TO THE FIRST ADAM

Guilt.

Depravity IN RELATION TO THE SECOND ADAM the Free Gift and the Consequent Modifications of Sin IN ITS RELATIONS GENERALLY to Theodicy to Government of Nations to Christian Doctrine to Human Nature to Sin in its Varieties HISTORICAL REVIEW

Profane

Jewish

Patristic Pelagian Controversy

Scholastic

Tridentine

Lutheran.

Calvinistic

Arminian

Methodist

Socinian

Rationalist The effect of the Fall upon the posterity of Adam is described in Scripture as the universal diffusion of death as a condemnation, and of a bias of human nature towards evil. The Scriptural doctrine finds its expression in the theological term Original Sin: the hereditary sin and hereditary sinfulness of mankind derived from Adam its natural head and representative, but derived from him as he was under a constitution of redeeming grace and connected with the Second Adam, the spiritual Head of mankind

Here we must first exhibit the testimony of inspiration, and then the historical development of the dogma. It may be observed at the outset that the doctrine of Original Sin is in an important respect the doctrine of sin itself; there is no aspect of the subject which is not more or less directly connected with the quality of evil as belonging to the race. Hence, many questions arising out of the subject generally will find their place here, having been indeed specially reserved for this section THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE The relation of the universal hereditary sin of mankind to the original sin of Adam, its relation to the covenant of redemption in Christ, and its character as resulting from both, are the topics now before us ORIGINAL SIN IN RELATION TO THE FIRST ADAM

St. Paul teaches that through one man sin entered into the world. It entered as bringing with it the condemnation of universal death: the guilt of the first transgression is reckoned in its consequences upon all the race represented by the first transgressor. But not apart from their own sin: all are not only regarded as sinners, but made sinners also through the inheritance of a nature of itself inclined only to evil. Thus the transmission of the penalty is both direct and indirect HEREDITARY GUILT

Hereditary guilt is not expressly stated in the form of a proposition: the phrase is of later than Scriptural origin. But where St. Paul establishes the connection between sin and death as its comprehensive penalty, he teaches that the condemnation of the first sin reigns over all mankind as in some sense one with Adam

1. After saying that death passed unto all men, for that (ef hoo, on the ground or presupposition that) all have sinned (or, all sinned), 1 thus asserting that in Divine imputation all, in some sense, sinned originally in Adam, the Apostle goes on to show that the death fell upon them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression. 2 It passed upon those who did not in Adam commit his offence, who did not, moreover, offend personally as he did. They sinned in Adam, though not guilty of the act of his sin: this then is hereditary condemnation, on those who were not personal transgressors and on them all. Here, it is obvious the penalty is primarily regarded as physical death. Every member of the race is involved in this consequence of the original sin of mankind 1 Romans 5:12; 2 Romans 5:14

2. Then follows the parallel with the Second One, Jesus Christ, to the same effect: If by the trespass of the one, the many be dead (or died), much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by One Man, Jesus Christ, [hath] abounded unto many. And not as through one that sinned (the many died), so is the gift: for the judgment came of one to condemnation, but the free gift of many trespasses unto justification. 1 In the three verses which follow the same deep truth is exhibited in three more forms, each increasing the strength of the preceding, and all culminating in the doctrine that as by one man's disobedience the many were made (or constituted, both in fact and by imputation) sinners, so by the obedience of One shall the many be made righteous. 2 Five paraphrases of the same statement declare that, in whatever sense the Redemption was an act external to the race and for its benefit, the Fall was external to the successive generations of mankind and for their condemnation. Here, it is obvious, or ought to be obvious, that the condemnation and the life are correlatives: the judgment is the opposite of the reign in life as the result of abundance of grace. It is this which St. Paul, the Christian expositor of original sin, stamps by a series of cumulative variations having no parallel in his writings 1 Romans 5:15-19; 2 Romans 5:19

3. In the Epistle to the Corinthians the connection between the doom of death and the sin of Adam is stated in almost the same terms; but the reference seems more limited to physical death than in the Epistle to the Romans. A careful examination, however, will show that there also death has the same deep and wide meaning. The central text is: for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. 1 Here that process of death is going on which in the Romans passed forth as a decree once for all: it is pántes apothneéskousin, but yet en toó Adám, in the one historical Man, and through their connection with him. The bodily resurrection is the argument of the chapter. The first man Adam became a living soul, the last Adam became a life-giving Spirit. 2 From the former

we derive a corruptible body animated by a living soul, which through sin lost the provision for its continued immortality: it is not taught that Adam received and transmitted only an animal or natural existence. From the Latter we receive the new gift of immortality, for soul and body, through the Spirit of life proceeding from Him. But the direct argument is limited to the bodily resurrection. Indirectly, how-ever, it asserts the great contrast between the sentence of eternal life and the sentence of eternal death The chapter ends by saying that the sting of death is sin: 3 it was the poison of that serpent which brought physical mortality into the race; but Christ died for our sins, 4 and not only for our resurrection from the grave as one penalty of offence. Death is abolished only AFTER THe resurrection: But when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. 5 Universal death is, to the saints, lost in the victory of life

1 1 Corinthians 15:22; 2 vs. 1 Corinthians 15:45; 3 vs. 1 Corinthians 15:56; 4 vs. 1 Corinthians 15:9; 5 vs. 1 Corinthians 15:54

4. St. Paul, to whom we owe the leading elements of this doctrine, does not carefully distinguish in what various senses the imputation of sin rests upon the race as death. The question will be raised in the historical controversies on the subject. Meanwhile, it may be observed that the strong word is hamartooloí katestátheesan hoi polloí, 1 which winds up his discussion, after the same idea had been several times left unexpressed, as the italics in our translation will show. Sinners all men were once for all accounted, or made, or constituted: they were placed in the category of transgressors. Sometimes this verb has the meaning of being made in the sense of being set or appointed by authority, but it never has that of being made through a process of becoming. In the glorious parallel, so by the obedience of One shall many be made righteous, 2 the term does not, strictly speaking, lose this meaning of establishment by imputation; for, whatever may be the righteousness imparted to the justified in Christ, they will, both in this world and the next, be accounted righteous through the One meritorious obedience. But, neither this strong word nor any other used in Scripture precludes the thought that those who are constituted sinners by their unity in Adam make his act their own in another sense: all the individuals of the many are accounted sinners, because they also, like Adam, have transgressed the covenant. 3 Still, the root of their offence is deeper than their individual life. Physical death precedes personal individual guilt. All men are altogether born in sins:4 in this the Jews spoke more truly than they intended. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; 5 and cannot as such see the kingdom of God, for they that we in the flesh cannot please God. 6 But to be born of the flesh is now, to speak reverently, the ordinance of God. Of the eternal penalty we speak not yet: [the free gift came] upon all men unto justification of life, of eternal life; 7 but justification presupposes a condemnation to be removed. And this must teach us not to soften down that strongest phrase of St. Paul on this subject: and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others, tékna fúsei orgeés.8

1 Romans 5:19; 2 Romans 5:19; 3 Hosea 6:7; 4 John 9:34; 5 John 3:6; John 3:3; 6 Romans 8:8; 7 Romans 5:18; Romans 5:21; 8 Ephesians 2:3

5. Though St. Paul has been spoken of as the teacher of original guilt, it must not be understood that he alone is responsible for this doctrine. He introduced nothing which he did not receive; and the Lord’s words already quoted sanction his teaching. It is not upon one isolated passage that the doctrine rests. It pervades the Scripture. It interprets the tone and spirit of the whole testimony of

the Bible as to the fallen family of the first father who sinned; and especially it interprets the relation of the Redeemer to mankind, a relation which absolutely requires the condemnation of the race as its basis. But of this we shall speak more particularly HEREDITARY DEPRAVITY The inheritance of a bias to evil is much more abundantly, though not more clearly, dwelt on in Scripture. The doctrine of a transmitted moral depravation or corruption pervades all the dispensations of revealed truth 1. In the Old Testament the proofs are ample and explicit

(1.) Its historical narrative takes it for granted that the root of individual personal life is sinful; it abounds with testimonies both to the universality of the sinful taint and to the propagation of it in the race. In the beginning of human history we find a book of the generations of Adam. 1 There it is stated that in the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made He him; that the two first parents of mankind were one Adam as the head of the race: male and female created He them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created. The narrative then proceeds to say that Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat (a son) in his own likeness, after his image. 2 This kind of language is never repeated, and, regarded as the preface to the history of the human corruption that ended in the Flood, may be quoted as probably the earliest text of the hereditary sinful tendency of mankind. The records of depravity which follow speak always of man as such, even when it excepts the godly. My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: 3 this verse is capable of another rendering, My Spirit shall not always govern in man; in their wandering they are flesh; which rather strengthens the denomination of mankind as flesh, resisting as such the Spirit of grace. It repented the Lord that He had made man on the earth; 4 for every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. 5 At the Flood this was the case with the ungodly, and the saved family of Noah were by nature no better than the rest. The history does not teach us that there were two races of men, one untainted by sin and the other corrupt. The sons of God 6 were those who began to call themselves by the name of the Lord. 7 Their father, as they were distinguished from the progeny of Cain, was Seth, whom Adam begat in his own likeness. 8 Their best descendant and representative was Noah, who was saved to continue the race, not because he was without sin, but because he found grace in the eyes of the Lord,9 like Lot afterwards, who said, Thy servant hath found grace in Thy sight, and Thou hast magnified Thy mercy. 10 Noah, the new head of mankind, proved that he continued the hereditary taint. He was accepted after the Flood through sacrifice. And the Lord said in His heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man’s sake; though the imagination of man’s heart is evil from his youth. 11 Here the very words which described the deep corruption of the race before it was swept away are used to describe the germ of the same corruption surviving the Flood

1 Genesis 5:1; 2 Genesis 5:3; 3 Genesis 4:3; 4 Genesis 6:6 5 Genesis 6:5; 6 Genesis 6:2; 7 Genesis 4:26; 8 Genesis 5:3; 9 Genesis 6:8; 10 Genesis 19:19; 11 Genesis 8:21

(2.) There is no question that the course of sin is regarded as running on from generation to generation among the nations of the earth. That it continued among the chosen people to be the law is proved by the institute of circumcision, which, whatever other purpose it served, was the ordained memorial of the sin connected with the propagation of the race, as well as by the series of ceremonial purifications that attended the birth of every child For the whole world—to anticipate—baptism carries the same signification

(3) Individual testimonies are not wanting. Job, the patriarchal theologian, asks, Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one. 1 This question is elsewhere answered by another: What is man, that he should be clean? and he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous? 2 In sin did my mother conceive me, 3 is the confession of one for all; in which David responds to Job, and almost literally to Bildad, how can he be clean that is born of a woman? 4 It is needless to quote other texts 1 Job 14:4; 2 Job 15:14; 3 Psalms 51:5; 4 Job 25:4 2. The New Testament throughout confirms this truth

(1.) Out of the heart, the Redeemer declares, proceed evil thoughts, 1 followed by the catalogue of sins in the life. The heart is the centre of the personality, of which the infallible Teacher says, If ye, then, BEING EVIL, 2 and that in connection with the good still remaining through the secret of grace in human nature. Why man is thus fundamentally evil, our Lord tells us in one emphatic text, which is the key to the early testimony of Genesis and to many others, especially in St. Paul: that which is born of the flesh is flesh.3 This word has stamped Christian phraseology: it takes the emblem of physical ruin, the flesh or mortal nature of man, to signify likewise his spiritual mortality; the flesh is the nature as tending not only to death but also to sin. What dissolution of soul and body is, the dissolution of harmony between the flesh and spirit is. But it more than hints at the derivation of the taint from natural descent: that which is born. 4 Thus also we have borne the image of the earthy, 5 and not only in our corruptible bodies. This testimony of Jesus, who knew what was inMan 1:6 — a most profound word, — is the supreme demonstration

It declares emphatically, what is nowhere else so plainly stated, that men are evil, because they are born evil, and pursue their way of life according to that evil beginning The Master has Himself taken the responsibility of this deep utterance, to which, after He has spoken it, the guilty and sinful nature of man responds: it reveals the thoughts of many hearts. It need not be said that He Himself is excepted who declares this fact of human generation. When He testified, Ye are from beneath, I am from above, 7 it may be thought that He was contrasting His spirit with that of His enemies; but when He added, Ye are of this world, I am not of this world, He proclaimed the universal difference between Himself and the children of men. The negative or apologetic appeal which follows, Which of you convinceth me of sin? 8 is for His enemies; those who believe in Him know that it was uttered from the consciousness of the Holy One of God, the only Person in human history of Whom it could be said, IN HIM IS NO SIN. 9 And to them the highest confirmation of the doctrine of hereditary human depravity is the sinless conception of the Redeemer Who was manifested to take away our sins

1 Matthew 15:19; 2 Matthew 7:11; 3 John 3:6; 4 Genesis 5:5; 5 1 Corinthians 15:49; 6 John 2:25; 7 John 8:23; 8 John 8:46; 9 1 John 3:5

(2.) St. Paul, though he did not hear the Lord’s words, faith-fully draws out their meaning on this subject. He uses the expression Flesh in this connection more than any other writer, and in such a way as to establish the propagation of a corrupted nature, Lest this should be misunderstood, that flesh is said by St. Paul to be the carnal mind,1 what in St James is not the fróneema, or thought, 2 but, in a less dignified expression, the epithumían, the concupiscence or lust 3 of the flesh. He calls it a law in my members, and the law of sin and death; and sin that dwelleth in me, 4 in the Me of the flesh. All these words, as following the Lord’s, show that the bias to evil is congenital. It is in the heart, as the representative of man’s being generally, and in his flesh, as the representative of

his fallen estate, that sin dwelleth; not indeed as a revolution of the elements of human nature, but as a depravation of its tendency. ' The Apostle has given our theology its term, Indwelling Sin. The sin which reigns in the human race, transmitted from father to son, dwells in every individual. It is an inmate in the soul, and an inmate only: in me, that is in my flesh, 5 in me as under an alien dominion, in me who may be delivered from it wholly But it belongs to every man that cometh into the world as a descendant of Adam, and it is bound up in his nature until the full deliverance is wrought: we may, therefore, with his full consent, invert the Apostle's words, and write them, in my flesh, that is, in me. St

Paul's exposition of original depravity, as illustrated by his own example, is closely connected with his struggles as a convinced sinner to find his way to the Redeemer. If we want the naked strength of his doctrine, we find it in other words, the carnal mind is enmity against God, tó fróneema teés sarkós échthra eis Theón, 6 the terse epigrammatic force of which is matched by what precedes, Tó gár fróneema teés sarkós thánatos, for that carnal mind is death 1 Romans 8:7; 2 James 1:14; 3 Romans 8:2; 4 Romans 7:17; Romans 7:23; 5 Romans 7:18; 6 Romans 8:7

3. It is to be observed that the Scripture never disjoins the condemnation from the depravity: the one is always implied in the other, while both are generally connected with the great salvation. It is impossible to conceive the two former apart from each other; though the precision of Scriptural language suggests rather that those who are born with a sinful bias are therefore condemned than that being condemned they are necessarily depraved. There is one passage that strikingly illustrates this. The Apostle speaks of the Ephesian converts as having been under the sway of the flesh, in the full sense as given above, and thus showing that they were by nature the children of wrath. 1 The depravity and condemnation of the natural estate are here once brought together: it is the solitary instance in which man's nature is said to be under wrath; but the wrath is upon those who lived after that nature rather than upon the nature itself; and both are brought into close connection with Christ, the light of whose coming redemption already shineth, though the darkness is not yet wholly past

1 Ephesians 2:3 ORIGINAL SIN IN RELATION TO THE SECOND ADAM The teaching of the later Scripture is summed up and confirmed by St. Paul, to the effect that Jesus Christ, the Second Adam, was given to the race of mankind, as the Fountain of an Original Righteousness that avails to efface and more than efface the effects of Original Sin in the case of all those who should be His spiritual seed. Hence this primitive Gift was an objective provision for all the descendants of the first sinner, the benefits of which were to be applied to those whose faith should embrace the Savior. But it is important to remember that it took the form of an original Free Gift to the entire race, before transgression began, and that it has in many respects affected the character of Original Sin: suspending the fall strength of its condemnation, and in some degree counteracting its depravity

I. When St. Paul calls Adam the figure of Him that was to come, túpos toú méllontos, 1 the word has its full significance. The type must precede the antitype in historical fact, but the antitype must precede the type in the Divine purpose: hence the Second Adam might be called the First; and the sin of Adam cannot be disjoined from the righteous obedience of the Deliverer. The virtue of the Atonement began when the evil of sin began. The Gospel was first preached when sin was first condemned: preached to the first offenders through the sentence passed upon Satan, the

instrumental cause of human sin, thus meeting sin in its very origin. While connecting it with Eve, its second original, the Apostle omits the Serpent, omits Eve herself, and makes Adam the fountain of sin to mankind, that he may draw the parallel between the first and the Second heads of the human race. He shows that, at all points and in all respects, the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by One Man, Jesus Christ2 — the chárisma and the doorea — are more abundant than the effects of the Fall. The provision of redemption from the disobedience meets it as sin and in its consequence as death. All human life and destiny is bound up with the relations of these two: the First and the Last Adam 1 Romans 5:14; 2 Romans 5:15

II. But the gift of righteousness to the race before the succession of its history began was of the nature of a provision to counteract the effects of sin, when original sin should become actual. It did not at once abolish the effects of the Fall in the first pair, whose original sin was also in their case actual transgression; it did not place them in a new probation, nor did it preclude the possibility of a future race of sinners. The great Atonement had now become necessary: as necessary to these parents of the race as it was after they had spread into countless multitudes. The Redeemer was already the Gift of God to man; but He was still o mellon, the Coming One, 1 as St. Paul once only calls Him in relation to this very fact: making the first sinner the first type of the Savior from sin The Atonement does not put away sin 2 in the sovereignty of arbitrary grace, but as the virtue of grace pardoning and healing all who believe. It began at once to build the house of a new humanity—a spiritual seed of the Second Adam—the first Adam being himself the first living stone of the new temple. And with reference to the life bestowed on this new race St. Paul strains language to show how much it super abounds, how much it surpasses the effect of the Fall. It might have been replied by the objector that the virtue of the gift fell short of the infliction of the first sentence; inasmuch as the sin sent forth death with absolute and unconditional effect upon all, while the grace reigns only in those who seek it and find it. But St. Paul, always quick to catch the tones of objection, whether of the vainMan 1:3 or otherwise, does not think fit to notice this. He sees in the fullness of his theology only the fact of a new and gracious probation in which superabundant life is provided for the race; and speaks precisely as if the benefit was accepted by all who needed it. Not that he forgets the distinction between the provision and the application of it. His precise use of the terms eis pantas and hoi polloi shows that he kept that in view

While he says that many were made sinners, 4 meaning all men, he changes the tense when he adds shall many be made righteous, not meaning all. But in the verse preceding there is no such difference: as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; and even so by the righteousness of One [the free gift came] upon all men unto justification of life. 5 It is true that our translation clothes the bones of the naked original here; but the naked original still more strongly stamps the antithesis: as by me offence, unto all men, to condemnation; even so, by One righteousness, unto all men, unto justification of life 1 Romans 5:14; 2 Hebrews 9:26; 3 James 2:20; 4 Romans 5:19; 5 vs. Romans 5:18

III. Hence it follows of necessity that the benefit of the Atonement provided before the foundation of the world 1 was a free gift to the coming race of mankind. That gift was the restoration of the Holy Spirit: not indeed as the indwelling Spirit of regeneration, but as the Spirit of enlightenment, striving, and conviction. Man did not set out on his way of sorrow without this preparatory Comforter. This was as it were the chárisma pneumatikón, the Spiritual Gift, which was freely bestowed on mankind before sin, strictly speaking, began its history, before the original sin of

Adam had become original sin in his posterity; which has therefore controlled and lightened the curse upon sin through all successive ages and generations. That blessing of Abraham 2 bestowed on the Gentiles through faith was the blessing of Adam 3 also, bestowed as yet without faith. And as the Spirit has been from the beginning the Spirit of Christ, 4 He is the true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. 5 When it was predicted that Christ should be for salvation unto the end of the earth, 6 the prediction, like many others, was a step in the revelation of the mystery which was kept secret since the world began. The glory of His people, the new and sanctified race, is and has ever been a light to lighten the Gentiles. 7 There was an earnest or pledge of the Coming Spirit given to the world as certainly as an earnest of the Incarnate Son was given. But we have to do specifically with the effect of this gift on the innate evil of our race. As it will finally for the saved super abound, abolishing the principle of sin as well as all innumerable transgressions, so from the beginning it restrained, controlled, and mitigated that evil, whether in the mind of God, or in the heart of man, or in the course of history. Without this there is no consistent exhibition of Original Sin 1 1 Peter 1:20; 2 Galatians 3:14; 3 1 Peter 1:11; 4 John 1:9; 5 Isaiah 49:6; 6 Romans 16:25; 7 Luke 2:32

IV. The doctrine in the light of redemption receives certain important modifications. This may be best shown by pointing out a few apparent contradictions which it reconciles and explains: these being referred to the two heads of condemnation and depravity and to the general relation of human nature to its penalty of evil 1. The nature is condemned, and yet it is universally redeemed

(1.) However difficult it may be, we must receive the fact of a human nature, abstracted from the persons who inherit it, lost or marred in Adam and found or retrieved in Christ

It is said of our Lord that He came, not only in the likeness of men, 1 but also in the likeness of sinful flesh. 2 This impressively connects the Incarnate One with our fallen humanity, not as partaking of its sin — for He was God manifest in the flesh 3— but as assuming our nature, without its sin and with its infirmity. Now, that fact assures us of the arrest of the effects of the Fall. In order that He might take our nature, and be made like unto His brethren, 4 the nature common to Him and us must be saved from utter revolution. It may be said therefore that the first effect of the redeeming intervention was to preserve the nature of man from sinking below the possibility of redemption: indeed rather that intervention was itself its preservation. Hence, not only was the natural image of God retained: the eternal sense of right and wrong and good and evil was not suffered to be effaced, and thus the elements of the moral image also were shielded from absolute violation. It is impossible to define what the difference was between the ruin of angelic intelligences and the fall of human nature: suffice that that difference is to us an infinite one; our life is in it. The Fall was the utter ruin of nothing in our humanity; only the depravation of every faculty. The human mind retains the principles of truth; the heart the capacity of holy affections; the will its freedom, not yet the freedom of necessary evil

All this we owe to the Second Adam. It is said, indeed, that He came only in the likeness of men; but He could not have come even in their likeness, if men had lost every trace of good. He could not have even tabernacled in our nature, if it had been in the worst possible sense corrupted and doomed to destruction 1 Php 2:7; 2 Romans 8:3; 3 1 Timothy 3:16; 4 Hebrews 2:17

(2.) The condemnation resting upon the race as such is removed by the virtue of the one oblation beginning with the beginning of sin. Our nature received the reconciliation1 once for all; God in

Christ is reconciled to the race of Adam; and no child of mankind is condemned eternally for the original offence, that is, for the fact of his being born into a condemned lineage. Of this immunity baptism, conferred upon all who enter the race, is the sign and the seal. Personality, virtual in all who are born, does not actually begin until the Will consciously assumes its responsibility. And for individual personal guilt forgiveness is provided, which ratifies the pardon of the one original transgression and super abounds for the many offences.2 Hence, though we do not assume a second personal fall in the case of each individual reaching the crisis of responsibility, we must believe that original sin as condemnation in the fullest sense, and as an absolute doom, never passed beyond Adam and the unindividualised nature of man. It was arrested in Christ as it regards every individual, and changed into a conditional sentence. As it is the penalty of physical death it is in one sense without mitigation: in Adam all die. But in another sense the penalty is lightened, relieved, and abolished; for in Christ shall all be made alive.3 1 Romans 5:11; 2 Romans 5:19; 3 1 Corinthians 15:22

2. And as certainly as the Free Gift qualifies the condemnation of original sin, so certainly it mitigates the depravity inherited by man. That depravity is universally admitted to be twofold: the absence of original righteousness and the bias to all evil. But these are one in the withdrawal of the Holy Ghost, the original bond of the soul's union with God. Now the Spirit was as surely given back to the race as the Atonement was given to it: given, that is, like the Atonement, as a provisional discipline of preparation for the fuller grace of redemption

(1.) The Spirit's universal influence qualifies original sin as He is in every responsible soul a Remembrancer of a forfeited estate, the Prompter to feel after God and regain that communion which all history proves to be an inextinguishable yearning of mankind. He suffers not the spirit of man to forget its great loss. It is through this preliminary universal influence that guilt is naturally in man ashamed of its deformity. If the descendants of Adam and Eve inherit their nature despoiled of righteousness, they inherit the sentiment also by which they knew that they were naked; 1 though this part of the inheritance comes from the original grace that the first offenders could not transmit. Shame, and the sense of despoilment and loss, are united with fear in the sacred phenomena of conscience, which must be essentially bound up with the doctrine of original sin

1 Genesis 3:7

(2.) But conscience suggests the thought, at least in man, of recovery; and the same Spirit who moves towards God in conscience, through fear and hope, universally touches the secret springs of the will. Original sin is utter powerlessness to good: it is in itself a hard and absolute captivity. But it is not left to itself. When the Apostle says that the Gentiles have the law written in their hearts, and in conscience measure their conduct by that standard, and may do by nature the things contained in the law, 1 he teaches us plainly that in the inmost recesses of nature there is the secret mystery of grace which, if not resisted and quenched, prompts the soul to feel after God, and gives it those secret, inexplicable beginnings of the movement towards good which fuller grace lays hold on. In fact, the very capacity of salvation proves that the inborn sinfulness of man has been in some degree restrained; that its tendency to absolute evil has been checked > and that natural ability and moral ability—to use the language of controversy—are one through the mysterious operation of a grace behind all human evil 1 Romans 2:14-15

3. Hence, in conclusion, the great antitheses of this doctrine are reconciled in the statement, carefully guarded, that original sin is the sin of Adam's descendants as under a covenant of grace. What it would otherwise have been we can never know; there would then have existed no federal union of mankind. The souls of Adam and Eve would have only added two more to the spirits of evil. As we know the doctrine and the fact, it is the harmony of truths in our being otherwise irreconcilable. Human nature is lost, and yet we are still the offspring of God. 1 The natural and moral image—essentially one in creation—has departed in its glory, and yet it is recognized as in some sense still existing

Every man is born condemned, and yet he is bidden not to put from him life. He is by nature able neither to think nor feel nor act aright; yet he is throughout Scripture appealed to as if his duty were simply matter of his will. In short, original sin and original grace met in the mystery of mercy at the very gate of Paradise

1 Acts 17:29 THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN IN ITSGENERAL RELATIONS

These points being established, we may view the doctrine that results from the combination: in its aspect towards the moral government of God and the vindication of His attributes; as explaining the Providential government of the human race; as related to the several doctrines of the Christian Faith; in its bearing on the constituent elements of human nature; and, lastly, in its effect upon the doctrine of sin generally, and in its particular manifestations, as under the discipline of the Gospel

I. Holy Scripture only in an indirect manner refers to the objections that may be urged against the righteousness of the Divine procedure in relation to the fundamental principles involved in the doctrine of original sin

1. St. Paul's thoughts, before and after the express treatment of the subject, seem to hover over this awful question of the vindication of God. But, under the guidance of inspiration, he leaves it where we must leave it, —among the unsolvable mysteries of the Eternal Will. No one, however, can fail to see that in the strict connection of the doctrine of universal sin with that of universal grace he finds rest to his own soul, and teaches us to find rest also. Every express delineation of the universal evil of mankind is, without exception, connected with redemption. This is the only vindication of the Righteous God from the tremendous charge brought against Him by the judgments of men. God's own Theodicy, or vindication of Himself, is exhibited in the free gift of the Second Adam

Original sin sprang from the federal constitution of the race; one in the unity of the unlimited many. But the many are one in recovery as well as in sin. As surely as sin and death passed through to the race, so surely from Christ did grace pass through

2. Other expedients for the reconciliation of the Divine economy with human judgments are adopted even by those who accept a doctrine of original sin: we may say, other methods of stating St. Paul's vindication. There are those who hold the THREE IMPUTATIONS which lie at the basis of human history—the imputation of Adam's sin to the whole world, the imputation of the sin of man to the Holy Representative of mankind, and the imputation to man of the benefit of His redemption—who nevertheless so held them as to increase the great difficulty instead of lessening it. The several reckonings are made to flow from an absolute sovereignty in God, giving no account of His matters

Though the word has a judicial sound it involves an arbitrary idea, and one which adds a superfluous harshness to our doctrine. The imputations are not equal and uniform: while the sin of the first Adam is imputed to all his posterity, the righteousness of the Second Adam is imputed only to a predetermined fragment of mankind. If it is said that the sins of those only were reckoned to Christ who receive the benefit, that does not lighten the gloom of the subject. The want of correspondence between the imputation in Original Sin and the imputation in Christian Righteousness lays a tremendous burden on the doctrine common to the two. Are not My ways equal? 1 This is the Lord's vindication of Himself; and, as to the theology which beclouds His justice, He says to it, are not your ways unequal?

1 Ezekiel 18:29

3. It may be rejoined, that St. Paul himself adopts the very method which we denounce, by making the federal covenant with man in Christ the correlative of the federal covenant with man in Adam. But he invariably asserts the universality of the benefit of grace, so far as concerns the intention of God. As to the why of this federal constitution, and the why of evil generally in the dark background, there is no solution given to man, because it is not possible to the creature. That mystery, like redemption itself, will in some sense be for ever hid in the Divine nature. It is, however, a mystery that is not lightened by rejecting the doctrine of original sin

II. Thus is explained the economy of God's providential government of the nations. If the exhibition of original sin is cut off from the universal gift, there can be no intelligible account given of the times of this ignorance which God winked at. 1 All heathenism, past and present, is on that theory inexplicable. The world has been ever groping after God: universal sinfulness must be reconciled with that fact. Not blank atheism, but the superfluity of superstition has been the law: a polytheistic superstition to which the nations were given up, because they resisted God's inner light; unspeakable degradation, and the almost unlimited change from dishonor to dishonor, marked the history of the heathen world; but only as the result of a rejection of influences that have striven with men. And light has been seen rising in the deepest dark-ness. Neither the Savior's intercourse with Gentiles, nor the Apostles', permits the supposition of such a total and unrelieved corruption, ruin, and abandonment of human nature as some dogmas of original sin and the "massa perditionis" assume. Tertullian's "anima naturaliter Christiana" may be set against this, as the opposite exaggeration: the truth lying in the middle. The absolute corruption of the roots of our nature is a Manichaean error, revived in Flacianism, but contradicted by the whole doctrine of original sin as taught in Scripture. Apart from Christ, and in hard theory, the ruin of man is complete. But man has never been in such a far country as not to hear the appeal of the Father: the far country2 is still the land of Emmanuel 1 Acts 17:30; 2 Luke 15:13

III. The connection between original sin and the Christian system is fundamental and universal. Upon it is based the necessity, the possibility, the universality of the Atonement, by the obedience of the Last Adam, Who bore in His own Person the consequences of the sin which He never shared. From original sin He was free: for, though His human nature was born of a woman, born under the law, 1 as bearing the consequences of human transgression, it was not begotten of man, but of the Holy Ghost

Hence the same Divine necessity that exempted Him from the sin of our nature demands that none other be exempt, not even His mother after the flesh. The sinlessness of Jesus is secured by

the miraculous conception, His impeccability by the hypostatic union; hence His active and His passive righteousness are united in one, the former rendering the latter possible and sufficient. Regeneration also derives its double character from the doctrine of original sin: it is the new creation of life in the soul, while it is at the same time the renewal of the original image of God; it is regeneration as the Divine commencement of a new life, renewal as the resulting process. But, before this, apart from this, and yet concurrently with it, Justification meets original sin as the reversal of its condemnation with the guilt of all that flows from it at the bar of God. And Ethical Sanctification in its beginning, process, and final issues, is the full eradication of the sin itself, which, reigning in the unregenerate, coexisting with the new life in the regenerate, is abolished in the wholly sanctified

1 Galatians 4:4

IV. It is expedient at this point to glance briefly at the constitution of man's nature as it is now found: of that nature namely, which alone we know as human. A few leading terms give us the general character of the humanity that sin has transmitted unimpaired as human nature, but entirely corrupt in its unassisted development as fallen and sinful nature

1. The term Human Nature is not used in this relation in Scripture. St. James alone speaks of teé fúsei teé anthroopínee, translated Mankind. 1 The word Nature signifies the condition or law of preappointed development, and thence the essential character and constitution with which every created thing comes into existence. It may therefore be applied to man in two senses, both faithful to the original meaning of the word: either to the constituent elements of his being, as differencing him from every other, or to the moral development of that being as growth from within, and apart from external influence. As to the latter, every individual of mankind is born with a nature which, without external influence upon it, is morally degraded and corrupt. The bias to evil— that is, to forget God, to serve the creature and to live for self—is innate and congenital; and this makes it the nature of man, as being inherent and not accidental. But, in the former sense of the term, sin is an accident of humanity: it came from without; it is not "das Gewordene," but "das Gemachte." It is not in harmony with the original constitution of man: conscience, and the law written in the heart or reason which is its standard, being witness. The distinction is always remembered in Scripture

1 James 3:7

2. The disturbance in the very essence of human nature may be regarded as affecting the entire personality of man as a spirit acting in a body. He is born with a nature which is— apart both from the external Evil One and from the external renewing power of the New Creation—under the bondage of sin. That bondage may be regarded with reference to the lower nature that enslaves the higher, and to the higher nature that is enslaved

(1.) Fallen human nature is Flesh or sarx: the whole being of man, body and soul, soul and spirit, separated from God, and objected to the creature. The autos ego of Self is without God, but only in the sense of being without Him as its God; and in the world, 1 as its false sphere of life and enjoyment. This is the slavery of sin to which man is naturally born, and to which he is naturally predetermined. For I know that in me, (that is in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: 2 this contains the truth concerning our fallen estate expressed by St. Paul as its representative. It is slavery, or a yoke imposed: I am carnal, sold under sin; 3 this I being the same person who can say, with the

mind, I myself serve the law of God, 4 and what I hate, that do I. 5 It is, however, an innate or inborn or predetermined slavery: the Apostle calls himself sárkinós, carnal, or fleshly, or fleshy, a strong word, which forbids the thought of his meaning the slavery of habit. If he wrote sarkikos, this term, as the antithesis of pneumatikos, 6 denoting an inherent characteristic of the law, would also point to an inherent quality of fallen nature. Again he refers to the sin that dwelleth in me: 7 not merely the sin that has gained an ascendancy from without And all this is confirmed by the strong words: for I delight in the law of God after the inward man: but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. 8 Such is the meaning of the flesh as the designation of depraved humanity enslaved to sense. Another use of the term, signifying human nature as mortal and frail, underlies the former; but this use is not directly connected with sin. In this latter sense Jesus Christ is come in the flesh;9 as to the former, He was sent only in the likeness of sinful flesh.10

1 Ephesians 2:12; 2 Romans 7:18; 3 Romans 7:14; 4 Romans 7:25; 5 Romans 7:15; 6 Romans 7:14; 7 Romans 7:17; 8 Romans 7:22-23; 9 1 John 4:3; 10 Romans 8:3

(2.) This slavery, however, has its more spiritual aspect. Starting from the same idea of the one personality in man, we may view the effect of original sin upon the autos ego in its higher principle, distinct from the flesh, though not apart from it. The one spiritual agent in man, operating through the three elements of his nature, body, soul, and spirit, and the three functions of his rational soul, the mind, the affections, and the will, is fettered and impotent to good. Hence its fallen dignity evermore utters the cry, Talaípooros egoó ánthroopos; 0 wretched man that I am! 1 The I of this wretched man is the personal representative of mankind, in whom original sin—sin that dwelleth in me2 — has been brought by the application of law from a latent state into activity. In me is qualified in two ways: that is, in my flesh; 3 and with the mind I myself. 4 Therefore the one personality has a double character: the inward man of the mind, to which to will is present and the flesh,5 or the body of sin, in which how to perform that which is good I find not. But the one person, to whom these opposite elements belong —an inner man, a reason, a will to good; a carnal bias, an outer man, a slavery to evil—is behind all these, behind even the inner man. And in him, in the inmost secret of his nature, is the original vice which gives birth to these contradictions. The Apostle adds three views of his own state with regard to this inherent sin; or, in other words, three views of that sin in regard to him. First, without the law he was alive, and sin was dead; 6 whatever difficulty there may be in explaining this of St. Paul, it precisely describes the sin that lies virtually latent in every human spirit, though abounding in dead works, 7 until the consciousness of sinful-ness is roused by the pressure of Divine law on the conscience. Secondly, the latent sin revived, or sprang into life, and he died, 8 both under its depravity and its condemnation: it wrought in me all manner of concupiscence: the original evil in him put forth all its varieties of form, and overwhelmed him with the proofs of its despotism. The indwelling sin which the law revealed reduced him to such impotence as could be defined only by death: the slavery of the natural man could not be more impressively exhibited Thirdly, there is the state of deliverance from the law of sin and death9 in regeneration

One important fact runs through the whole description: the absolute bondage of the nobler faculty, here called the mind, to the flesh, rendering the will powerless to perform its ineffectual desire

1 Romans 7:24; 2 Romans 7:17; 3 Romans 7:18; 4 Romans 7:25; 5 Romans 7:22; Romans 7:25; Romans 7:18; 6 Romans 7:8-9; 7 Hebrews 6:1; 8 Romans 7:8; 9 Romans 8:2

(3.) In this picture of the original corruption of human nature there are some features which must be intently regarded: they will be only mentioned in passing now, as their fuller consideration belongs to the economy of grace and the plan of salvation. It teaches most distinctly the freedom of the will, and at the same time the inability of man to do what is good. The harmony of these seeming opposites is most manifest: the faculty of willing is untouched in any case, and the influence of conscience prompts it to will the right; but this is bound up with a miserable impotence to good, and results in both a natural and a moral inability to do what the law of God requires. It shows most impressively that man, in his natural state, or in the flesh, must be under the Divine displeasure as the voluntary agent of the sin that seems nevertheless a law in the members only. Here there is a paradox in the Apostle's words: Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me:1 this is the outcry and protest of the soul against its slavery; but it is slavery still, bringing the ME into captivity to the law of sin, and into a captivity to evil with which a sense of guilt is inseparably connected. It shows that the corruption of the nature is consistent with the presence of an unextinguished sense of right, and even desire for it, which the Good Spirit through the law excites. St. Paul may be said to be describing not a state of nature, but a state of conviction produced by the Holy Ghost. This is certainly true, though the Apostle does not make the distinction. But it must be remembered that the inward man and the law of my mind 2 are expressions which do not mean anything increated by Divine influence through the law The Holy Spirit speaks to a dead or sleeping man within the sinner, and revives a law that may have been long silent, obsolete, and in this sense dead 1 Romans 7:20; 2 Romans 7:22-23

3. Against this gentler interpretation arise two classes of objectors. First, there are those who make original sin the absolute destruction of the image of God and of the capacity of good in man: of these much has been already said, and it will hereafter be shown, when we come to the Gospel of grace, how inconsistent this view is with the universal benefit of redemption. Secondly, there are those who interpret the primitive Fall to have been the loss of the Spirit as an essential element of human nature, given sacrameritally back through the incarnation of Christ applied: these also must hereafter be referred to. Finally, in defense of our position generally, it may be said that the misery of the wretched man, bound to the body of death, is only aggravated by the fact that there is a better nature beneath the worse. This does not mitigate original sin as misery, impotence, and the source of condemnation; but it makes the exhibition of it consistent with the universality of redeeming grace

V. It remains now to trace the connection of this doctrine with the history and development of sin generally. Original sin cannot be distinguished from its personal and actual manifestation. It is the source of all the varieties of sin that are known in experience and described in Scripture: that other fountain originally opened for sin and uncleanness, the streams of which in human life are infinitely diversified

1. The sin of our nature, indwelling in the soul, is its HABITUAL state, as opposed to ACTUAL transgressions. The former is sinful-ness, the latter more properly sin. Hence there is a secret filthiness of the flesh and spirit,1 as distinguished from the works of the flesh which are manifest. 2 The habitual or original principle of evil may remain after its works have ceased, waiting for the act

of grace which shall entirely extinguish it 1 2 Corinthians 7:1; 2 Galatians 5:19 2. Actual transgressions may be variously summarised.

(1.) They may be offences of the heart's desire and imagination; of the words and of the acts; or, since the words are at once expressions of the thought and themselves acts, we may say sins of the thought and of the deed.

(2.) They may be viewed in relation to the Divine law, and be divided into offences against God, against our neighbor, and against ourselves. These three are really one, since there is no sin but against God; but the Decalogue, and the general strain of Scripture, suggest the distinction.

(3.) Estimating them, by the temptation that leads to the act, we have the division of selfishness, carnality, and worldliness; the first, however, according to St. James, being the root of all: Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust. 1 Every act of sin is the expression of the heart's consent to some solicitation; but the solicitation may appeal directly to the internal affection, or come through the medium of the eye which desires to have, or tempt the spirit alienated from God and absorbed in its own pride. Hence St. John's definition of the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life. 2 It is impossible to distinguish with certainty between the transgressions to which Satan directly tempts, and those to which inbred sin alone excites. Great spiritual skill, however, may be attained in this by those who, in the spirit of St. Paul's words studying the Tempter, are not ignorant of his devices, 3 on the one hand, and, on the other, remember his exhortation prove your own selves.4 1 James 1:14; 2 1 John 2:16; 3 2 Corinthians 2:11; 4 2 Corinthians 13:5 3. As it respects measures of guilt, there are two views which the Scriptures harmonies

He who breaks any commandment is guilty of all; 1 and the distinction between MORTAL and VENIAL is essentially unfounded. Yet differences are marked, according as the will, the final principle of all transgression, enters into the act of the soul.

(1.) Not only are there sins of OMISSION and COMMISSION, but there are sins VOLUNTARY or willful, and sins INVOLUNTARY, the result of ignorance and infirmity. 2 The supreme Judge reveals Himself as taking those differences into account. Hence there is an evangelical doctrine of mortal and venial offence. All sin is mortal, as the wages of sin is death; all sins are venial, inasmuch as Christ died for the expiation of all.

(2.) But thrice the Scripture declares that there is the possibility of deadly and unpardonable sin in this world. Our Lord speaks of such a sin AGAINST THE HOLY GHOST, and that in three Evangelists: 3 the Epistle to the Hebrews adds another, and St. John gives his final testimony in his First Epistle. In the Gospels, it is the state of the heart hardened against Divine grace, blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, and therefore of necessity hopeless: in this world it refuses forgiveness, and in the world to come its eternal condemnation follows. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is the sin against the Atonement, the absolute rejection of which by equal necessity shuts out all hope, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh.4 In St. John's words this last sin is simply against God who provided the rejected Atonement, and sent the despised Spirit: it is a sin for which intercession may be vain: I do not say that he shall pray for it. 5

(3.) The stages by which actual and willful transgression reaches this unpardonable height may be profitably marked. There is a condition in which the soul thwarts the influence of Divine grace,

referred to throughout the Scripture as being constantly in opposition to the Spirit: ye do always resist the Holy Ghost. 6 This is perhaps the most universal characteristic of active sin, as the monitions of the Supreme Convincer are bound up with all the activities of conscience and the Word of God. Successful opposition to His influence produces two opposite effects, conspiring however to one result. The soul's sensibility declines, and that state follows which is described in Scripture as the sleep of indifference or carnal security: having their conscience seared with a hot iron, entangled in the snare of the devil, 7 and taken captive by him at his will, 8 and willing and able to turn away their ears from the truth. 9 St. Paul shows that this condition is consistent with a pretence to religion: speaking lies in hypocrisy. 10 The Savior's denunciations of the hypocrites for whom His sternest woes were reserved, teach us what a fearful connection there may be between utter insensibility to Divine grace and devotion to the semblance of godliness. But the obverse of this selfengendered deadness to the Spirit's influence is die direct hardening of the soul through the judicial withdrawal of that influence. Upon this follows the secret of utter antagonism to truth: that decisive reprobation which overtakes those who in a special sense have turned aside after Satan, 11 and learned like him to call evil good. But this specific sin against the Spirit can have been committed by none who have grace enough to dread its commission, or who have the slightest true desire of return

1 James 2:10; 2 Psalms 19:12-13; 3 Matthew 12:31, Luke 12:10, Mark 3:29; 4 Hebrews 6:6; 5 1 John 5:16; 6 Acts 7:51; 7 1 Timothy 4:2; 8 2 Timothy 2:26; 9 2 Timothy 4:4; 10 1 Timothy 4:2; 11 1 Timothy 5:15

4. Lastly, moral evil in the renewed soul has a distinct character. Here again we have a reconciliation of opposites. On the one hand, there is no sin in the regenerate spirit: whosoever is born of God sinneth not. 1 The evil of his nature still remaining is not reckoned to him, and he keepeth himself from actual transgression: that wicked one toucheth him not. On the other hand, the new spiritual life only makes his residuary corruption more intolerable. The sanctified mind knows iniquity, through the revelation of the law of grace, as the unsanctified cannot know it. Thus original sin is in reality perceived in its utter vileness only by those who are not condemned for it, and who, with all their hearts, are seeking its destruction. Here comes in the distinction between defects of infirmity or secret faults which do not exclude from grace, not having in them the true nature of sin, and offences committed in spite of His remonstrance which grieve the Holy Spirit, and if persisted in cause Him though slowly to take His departure. It is the sure characteristic of regeneration that it is impatient of remaining impurity. He that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit: 2 his deep desire, the strongest sentiment of his new nature, is to be delivered from that which cannot be common to himself and his Lord. The penitent seeking his first pardon sets his expectation on the Lamb of God Which beareth the sin of the world. 3 But the renewed and forgiven believer keeps his eye fixed on the perfect holiness of his Savior. The children of God know that He was manifested to take away our sins, 4 and not only to bear away our guilt. They read the words that follow as containing the Divine encouragement of the ambition of faith: IN HIM IS NO SIN. 5 He alone was and is without the original offence; and by His grace we may come to the high experience that as He is so are we in this world. 6 It is of this new commandment also the Apostle of perfected love says, or may be understood to say: hó estin aleethés en autoó kaí en humín, what is true in Him and you. 7 Hence, we must be careful to remember the Scriptural modifications of the terms that define original sin as lingering in the regenerate and doomed to

destruction. It is no longer, strictly speaking, INDWELLING Sin. It is not, in any sense, the law in my members. 8 Nor is it the carnal mind, which is enmity against God. 9 But it may be described as the old man, or, as the Rabbins said, the Old Adam, made old by the new nature; and this old man has a body of sin which is crucified, in order that it may be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. 10 St. Paul's chosen term is the flesh with its affections and lusts, which they that are Christ's have crucified.11

1 1 John 5:18; 1 John 3:9; 2 1 Corinthians 6:17; 3 John 1:29; 4 1 John 3:5; 5 1 John 4:17; 6 1 John 2:8; 7 1 John 2:8; 8 Romans 7:20; Romans 7:23; 9 Romans 8:7; 10 Romans 6:6; 11 Galatians 4:24

HISTORICAL The doctrine of Sin, especially of Original Sin, occupies a large space in historical theology, inasmuch as it touches at some points almost every other branch of the Christian system. There is, strictly speaking, no development of dogma: only the exhibition of a successive series of collisions between the Scriptural statements and the current opinions of the Church. A few points may be noted in their chronological order

I. It may be said, at the outset, that the fundamentals of our doctrine have been most firmly held by mankind universally. This is a point of great importance, connecting the most profound revelation of Scripture with the theology of nature

1. The brief reference already made to the Theories of Evil has shown that Pantheism and Dualism have successively ruled ancient and modern thought on the subject. But it cannot have escaped notice that neither of these theories gave a good account of the unlimited influence of sin in the human race. Indeed neither of them could confront the question, inasmuch as the fundamental principles of both were opposed to an absolutely universal power of the evil principle. Not attempting to define sin, and with a very vague idea of its true nature, the systems of ancient mythology — Egyptian, Phoenician, Vedic, Hellenic—all accepted a certain composite of light and darkness, good and evil, which made up to their imaginations the sum of things in Nature. Forces of evil equally with forces of good were acknowledged and worshipped; and the very same names, as in the case of the DAEVAS, came to be applied to both

2. Meanwhile, it cannot be doubted that there was a gradual preparation in the human mind for the final teaching of the Word of God. While the Eastern systems of thought shaped more and more distinctly, in Persia the idea of one Personal Righteousness, and in Buddhism the essential evil of existence as self-separated from God, Hellenic thought, expressed in its drama especially, developed the conception of a stern and awful Nemesis, the Vindicator of moral order. Falling immeasurably below the ethical grandeur of the Bible, the tragedians and philosophers of Greece, and the historians of both Greece and Rome, abound in presentiments of the truth. As to the inherent sinfulness of the race, in particular, the following words are forcible. A line of Sophocles says: Anthropois gar tois pasi koinon esti touxamartanein. As to the origin of this universal sin Thucydides makes the vigorous remark: pephukasi apantes kai idia kai dhmosia, amartanein. And one more striking still is found in a fragment of Euripides: emphutos pasin anthropois kakh, rendered by Horace, Nam vitiis nemo sine nascitur. So Tacitus: Vitia erunt donec homines. But though the sense of sin is variously and unequally expressed in various nations and various literatures, in none is the testimony to its universality wanting. While so many traditions, however, point to a past age of uprightness and of man's declension, none contain hints of the great

revelation of the Bible, that the whole race of mankind had its probation and fall in one progenitor

II. The Ancient Church, both under the guidance of inspiration and in the Rabbinical age, has held the essentials of the doctrine of moral evil in itself, and of original sin in particular

1. It has been seen that the Old-Testament Scriptures maintain one consistent and uniform teaching as to the nature of sin generally, and as to its universal power over mankind. The history of the Flood gives its evidence both in clear testimony and in awful judgment The covenant rite of circumcision significantly declared the hereditary sinfulness of man The entire system of the Levitical economy was based on this assumption: while its trespass-offerings had more specific reference to individual offences, its sin-offerings had general reference to the deeper root of universal sin. The Psalms and Prophets abound in testimonies to the same effect: not only asserting the universality of past and present sin among men, but also asserting it with equal confidence concerning the unlimited future, One Being only excepted, the Righteous Servant of Jehovah. Generally it may be said that on no one subject is the teaching of the ancient Scriptures at once more elevated above all extra-Biblical ideas, and more steadfast and uniform in itself than on this. It proclaims that EVIL, or ra, the permitted consequence of sin, is under the Divine disposal, and not independent of the Divine will: I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil; I the Lord do all these things. 1 But the same evil, in respect to the SIN, which causes it, is evermore traced to the willful rebellion of the human will: And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil (ra) continually. 2 There is hardly here the usual development of Scriptural revelation. The progressive dispensations expand the doctrine into abundant details to meet the gradual development of the method of atonement; but the fundamental idea of SIN is unique in its hard simplicity throughout the Scriptures 1 Isaiah 14:7; 2 Genesis 6:5

2. And it is equally certain that the later Jewish doctrine exhibited the outlines of the truth, even in some respects more clearly stamped than in the ancient Scriptures themselves. Rabbinical authors make much use of the typical relation of Adam to Christ: Quemadmodum homo primus fuit primus in peccato, sic Messias erit ultimus ad auferendum peccatum penitus. And Adamus postremus est Messias. The Book of Ecclesiasticus declares that every man from his youth is given to evil;1 Philo abounds in mystical accounts of its origin and universal influence; and a long-descended ancient tradition is summed up by one of the Rabbinical commentators on Genesis: The first man was the cause of death to all his descendants

1 Ecc. 17:16

III. The early Christian Church exhibits the truth as it has been deduced from Scripture, but with the germ of every subsequent error here and there appearing. Before the Pelagian heresy the Greek and Latin fathers generally held the Vitium Originis, as Tertullian first called it, but laid stress upon the co-operation of the human will enlightened by teaching and grace. The Latins were still more decided as to both. For instance, Ambrose says: Omnes in primo homine peccavimus; and, Nulla species cujusquam virtutis occurrit, quae vel sine dono Divinae gratiae vel sine consensu nostrae voluntatis habeatur. So Lactantius: Non neces-sitatis esse peccare, sed propositi ac voluntatis. With one consent they held the doctrine of Tertullian as to the image of God in man, of which it is said that non tam extinguitur quam obum-bratur. Origen broached the old notion of a pre-existent state and fall of the soul: this has been revived again and again, but adds to the

difficulty which it seeks to remove

IV. The PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY of the fifth century in most of its bearings and issues turned upon the doctrine of Original sin. Pelagius, and his followers Caelestius and Julian, taught that transgression can be regarded only as the independent act of the free will of the individual; that Adam was created mortal, his offence having hurt himself alone; and that his descendants are born in precisely the same moral condition; that the prevalence of sin in his descendants is the result of following his example: in eo quod omnes peccaverunt exemplo Adami; and by a longa consuetudo vitiorum it comes that vitia quodammodo vim habere naturae. All the stress was laid upon the free selfdetermination of every man living to good or evil, the perfection of good being attainable by every independent individual through the grace of his nature and the law and the example of Christ. But Augustine, at the other extreme, taught that in Adamo omnes peccaverunt, omnes ille unus fuerunt: we all were that One, and SINNED IN HIM 1 (by a mistranslation of Romans 5:12ef hoó pántes heémarton). The corruption of nature — peccatum originis — beginning in Adam was concupiscentia, the ascendency of the flesh over the spirit; it introduced a certain necessity of sinning, the freedom of the will having no meaning save as opposed to external compulsion: and this, transmitted to his posterity, makes them sinners and guilty in themselves as well as in Adam. SEMI-PELAGIANISM strove to mediate between these two extremes. It admitted original sin so far as concerns the weakening of the power to will and to do; limited the death of the Fall to physical death: regarded man's residual energies as sufficient to set him upon the beginnings of salvation, but the Divine grace as absolutely necessary to carry on and perfect it. The Augustinian doctrine gained the ascendancy, and still reigns in all Predestinarian systems

Pelagianism pure and simple has never held its ground, at least among those who have any faith in the Christian Scriptures. Semi-pelagianism however has, on the whole, exerted the widest influence: it reappeared dogmatically in the Lutheran Synergism, and in the spirit at least of its teaching has pervaded all communions which have denied the dogma of individual predestination

1 Romans 5:12

V. The Mediaeval controversies were mainly transitional. The Schoolmen spent all their subtlety upon the questions involved; but they simply furnished the materials for future confessions. Among the new topics which they raised are the following. The punishment of original sin was supposed by some to be the negative loss of the vision of God: the utmost point Augustine, fairly interpreted, had in his day reached. But to the poena damni, or loss, was added the poena sensus, even in the case of children unbaptised: for strongly maintaining this Gregory of Ariminum was branded with the name of Childtormentor The law of the propagation of evil was also much contested. Peter Lombard advocated the theory known as CREATIONISM: the immaterial spirit infused into the begotten organism of the soul and body contracts defilement and becomes guilty. Anselm and Aquinas asserted TRADUCIANISM: Persona erat Adam, natura homo; fecit igitur persona peccatricem naturam. Adam's person corrupted the nature; and in his descendants the nature corrupts the person. In favor of the latter is the whole doctrine of original sin, and especially the incarnation of Christ, Whose human nature was created and not transmitted to Him. Against the former is the danger of making God the author of human evil; while it may be thought to be defended by the dignity of the rational soul, the name FATHER OF SPIRITS 1 given to God, and

the tendency of the opposite theory to Materialism The IMMACULATE CONCEPTION of the Virgin was early introduced into the question: it divided the Schoolmen, many of the best of whom recoiled from the thought that one member of the race should be made holy without the intervention of atonement; and was left among the "Pious Opinions" of the Church, until, in 1854, it was made an article of faith by Rome. Freewill and its relation to grace were largely discussed. The distinction expressed in the term "Meritum condigni et congrui" was invented in order to show the value set by God upon the workings of nature towards grace: they have a merit which it is congruous with the Divine justice to reward by further gifts, and this is a Meritum de congruo; while, after his justification, the works of the Christian have a higher merit, a Meritum de condigno, earning eternal life. But the source of good in man since the Fall is the Divine Spirit, and all merit is excluded. One of the authors of the distinction, Peter Lombard, left this noble sentence: Libertas a peccato et a miseria per gratiam est; libertas vero a necessitate per naturam. Ipsa gratia, voluntatem praevenit praeparando ut velit bonum, et praeparatam adjuvat ut perficiat

1 Hebrews 12:9

VI. The dogma defined in the Council of Trent combines the Augustinian Realistic identification of Adam and the race with the semi-Pelagian negative idea of the effect of the Fall. Adam, created in the image of God, with the endowment of freewill, and perfect harmony in the purely natural elements, had the gift of original righteousness added; " CONDITUS in puris naturalibus" he was then "in justitia et sanctitate CONSTITUTUS." Original righteousness was a supernatural added gift, and the loss of it threw the race back into its created condition of contrariety between flesh and spirit, without the superadded restraint. In baptism the guilt of the original offence which incurred the loss is taken away, and yet the concupiscence that sprang from transgression and leads to transgression remains untaken away, not having, however, itself the essential quality of evil: " this concupiscence, which the Apostle sometimes denominates sin, the Holy Synod declares the Catholic Church never understood to be called sin because it is really and truly sin in the regenerate, but because it is from sin and inclines to sin." Against this the Reformed Confessions all protested, asserting that concupiscence has in it the nature of sin. For the rest, the Roman theory admits that the natural image has been clouded through the Fall: man’s whole nature being wounded, and propagated as such. These points were referred to when the First Estate of man was the subject, and we must again and again return to them

VII. The Lutheran standards deny the Tridertine doctrine. Under the influence of a dread of semi-Pelagianism as tending to the idea of merit in man, the formularies were constructed in the Augustinian spirit. Original sin is defect of original righteousness, and a depraved concupiscence in the higher faculties towards carnal things. In the Smalkald Articles " the corruption of nature is so profound and dark as to be past human comprehension, but must be received as matter of revelation and faith." In the Formula of Concord two opposite tendencies are met and opposed. On the one hand, the Synergists, who insisted on a certain measure of co-operation in the human will, sunergein, were withstood by the affirmation that, while in natural things man may do good, in spiritual things his will is entirely bound; on the other hand, the doctrine of Flacius, that original sin is a corruption of the substance of nature, the actual image of the devil, was opposed by the affirmation that sin is only an accident of the nature, the act and not the essence of the soul

VIII. Calvin and the Reformed Confessions make no distinction between the imputed guilt and the inherent depravity of man’s fallen estate. But much controversy arose afterwards as to the nature and order of the two imputations. The Reformed school of Saumur, represented by Placaeus, held that " vitiositas praecedit imputationem:" there is a MEDIATE or consequent imputation, following and dependent on individual corruption But the other theory, IMMEDIATE or antecedent imputation, has predominated: this makes the sin of Adam, as the federal head of the race, the exclusive or prior ground of condemnation. The FEDERAL theology of the vicarious representation of mankind by Adam, in virtue of a covenant of nature or of works (foedus operum, foedus naturae), is divided into two classes, according as it makes prominent the realistic identity of mankind with Adam, or otherwise: in the former case, there is a moral as well as legal imputation; in the latter, the imputation is altogether forensic. But both separate too sharply the supposed covenant of works from the real covenant of grace in Christ. The more forensic and representative imputation has taken, in later years, the form of a forfeiture on the part of Adam of CHARTERED PRIVILEGES which, through his fault, all mankind have lost: this loss being original sin. But such speculations as these stand or fall with the general principle of a specific covenant with Adam as representing his posterity, a covenant of which the Scripture does not speak. There is but one Covenant, and of that Christ is the Mediator

IX. The Arminian doctrine in its purest and best form avoided the error of the previous theories, retaining their truth. It held the Adamic unity of the race: " in Adam all have sinned," and "all men are by nature children of wrath." But it maintained also " that the most gracious God has provided for all a remedy for that general evil which was derived to us from Adam, free and gratuitous in His beloved Son Jesus Christ, as it were a new and another Adam. So that the baneful error of those is plainly apparent who are accustomed to found upon that original sin the decree of absolute reprobation invented by themselves." This " evil" is " eternal death together with manifold miseries." " But there is no ground for the assertion that the sin of Adam was imputed to his posterity in the sense that God actually judged the posterity of Adam to be guilty of and’ chargeable with (reos) the same sin and crime that Adam had committed." These words of the Apology for the Remonstrant Confession are confirmed by those of Arminius: " 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 which on that very account may be denominated sin." The Canons of the Synod of Dort (1618) gave the most concentrated Calvinistic contradiction to all these views. As to freewill and grace Limborch says: " Grace is not the solitary, yet is the primary cause of salvation; for the cooperation of freewill is due to grace as a primary cause; for, unless the freewill had been excited by prevenient grace, it would not be able to co-operate with grace." Accordingly, he and the other leaders of Arminianism asserted the universal diffusion of prevenient influences of the Spirit; the acceptance in every age of those who strive after natural uprightness, " honestati naturali operam dent"; and, above all, the Free Gift to the whole race in Christ, which is the foundation of their whole system

X. The Methodist teaching on this subject is sometimes set down without any qualification as Arminian; sometimes it is charged with being semi-Pelagian

1. It differs from the Remonstrant doctrine, where that doctrine, in its protest against the decisions of the Synod of Dort declined from the earlier teaching of Arminius. The later Remonstrants laid great stress on the physical impurity of our nature, denied that this corruption of that nature has in

it the true characteristics of sin, and attributed too much to the "innate liberty of the human will," as able to co-operate of itself with Divine law

Methodism accepts the Article of the English Church: " Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk); but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam; whereby man is very far gone from Original Righteousness [quam longissime distet], 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 And this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek phronhma sarkos, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire, of the flesh, is not subject to the law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin." Hence it holds that whatever power there is in the human will—in its ability as well as in its choice—comes from the redemption of Christ

2. It holds, with the purest Arminianism, earlier or later, that no ability remains in man to return to God; and this avowal concedes and vindicates the pith of original sin as internal The natural man—whether his naturalness is described by the sin of his flesh, carnal, as he is sarkikos, or the sin of his soul, sensual, as he is psuxikos—is without the power even to co-operate with Divine influence. The co-operation with grace is of grace. Thus it keeps itself for ever safe from Pelagianism and semi-Pelagianism

3. It has, however, more fully and consistently than the Remonstrant system connected the universality of grace with the universality of redemption: knowing nothing of the Augustinian COMMON GRACE A few extracts will make this plain

(1.) Mr. Wesley, whose treatise on Original Sin is one of the most faithful and stern reflections of the Scriptural doctrine that our language contains, dwells upon this universal gift in very many passages of his writings. For instance, in his sermon on the Scripture way of Salvation: " So that the salvation which is here spoken of might be intended to be the entire work of God, from the first dawning of grace in the soul till it is consummated in glory. If we take this in its utmost extent it will include all that is wrought in the soul by what, is frequently termed natural conscience, but, more properly, preventing grace; all the drawings of the Father; the desires after God, which, if we yield to them, increase more and more; all that light wherewith the Son of God 'enlighteneth every one that cometh into the world;' showing every man ' to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with his God;' all the convictions which His Spirit, from time to time, works in every child of man; although, it is true, the generality of men stifle them as soon as possible, and after a while forget, or at least deny, that they ever had them at all." In another passage in the sermon on Working out our own Salvation: " For, allowing that all the souls of men are dead in sin by nature, this excuses none, seeing there is no man that is 'in a state of mere nature; there is no man, unless he has quenched the Spirit, that is wholly void of the grace of God. No man living is entirely destitute of what is vulgarly called natural conscience. But this is not natural: it is more properly termed preventing grace. Every man has a greater or less measure of this, which waiteth not for the call of man." " That by the offence of one judgment came upon all men (all born into the world) to condemnation is an undoubted truth, and affects every infant, as well as every adult person. But it

is equally true that by the righteousness of One the free gift came upon all men (all born into the world—infants and adults) unto justification." Finally: "I assert that there is a measure of freewill supernaturally restored to every man, together with that supernatural light." So Mr. Fletcher: "As Adam brought a general condemnation and a universal seed of death upon all infants, so Christ brings upon them a general justification and a universal seed of life." Mr. Watson, in his " Institutes," largely treats on this subject. The following are a few sentences from the close of his discussion

(2.) "But virtues grounded on principle, though an imperfect one, and, therefore, neither negative nor simulated, may also be found among the unregenerate, and have existed, doubtless, in all ages. These, however, are not from men but from God; Whose Holy Spirit has been vouchsafed to the world, through the Atonement. This great truth has often been lost sight of in the controversy. Some Calvinists seem to acknowledge it substantially, under the name of ’ common grace;’ others choose rather to refer all appearances of virtue to nature, and thus, by attempting to avoid the doctrine of the gift of the Spirit to all mankind, attribute to nature what is inconsistent with their opinion of its entire corruption. But there is, doubtless, to be sometimes found in men not yet regenerate in the Scriptural sense, in men not even decided in their choice, something of moral excellence, which cannot be referred to any of the causes above adduced, and of a much higher character than is to be attributed to a nature which, when left to itself, is totally destitute of spiritual life. Compunction for sin, strong desires to be freed from its tyranny, such a fear of God as preserves them from many evils, charity, kindness, good neighborhood, general respect for goodness and good men, a lofty sense of honor and justice, and, indeed (as the very command issued to them to ’repent and believe the Gospel,’ in order to their salvation, implies), a power of consideration, prayer, and turning to God, so as to commence that course which, persevered in, would lead on to forgiveness and regeneration. To say that ’ all these are to be attributed to mere nature’ is, to surrender the argument to the semi-Pelagian, who contends that these are proofs that man is not wholly degenerate . . .. The Scriptural proof that the Spirit is given to ’ the world’ is obvious and decisive. We have seen that the curse of the law implied a denial of the Spirit; the removal of that curse implies, therefore, the gift of the Spirit, and the benefit must be as large and extensive as the Atonement." 4. On the whole, it may be said that the doctrine, thus stated, is the only one that is in harmony with all the facts of the case: it omits nothing, softens nothing, and evades nothing. This position may be further fortified by a comparison with some other leading systems which have been referred to

(1.) With the Tridentine decisions it has many points of agreement, but more of difference. The teaching of Rome is not consistent with itself in its view of the actual state of man as affected by the Fall. It holds original sin, the corruption of human nature, and the imputation of Adam’s offence as a condemnation of the race. The Roman Catechism affirms that we are oppressed by the vice of our birth, "naturae vitio premimur,’ and that the virus of sin penetrates to what is strongest in our souls, "rationem et voluntatem, quae maxime solidae sunt animae partes." Yet it more than hints that the departure of Original Righteousness has simply thrown man back into the position in which he was created, as if a natural antagonism between flesh and spirit was the normal state of humanity in the purpose of the Creator. The negative loss and the positive strength of evil are not harmonized. Again, maintaining rightly that the condemnation of the original offence is removed by baptism — that is, more correctly, by the atoning efficacy of which baptism is the seal—it further

declares, as has been seen, that concupiscence in the baptized, that is, the regenerate, is not of the nature of sin: as if baptism could make that which is essentially sinful cease to be such; as if the perversion of the will, which constitutes us formally sinners as soon as we feel and assent to its operation, were not in itself sinful. The Council correctly lays down that without the preventing grace of God men cannot exhibit those graces which prepare for justification; and that they can co-operate with this preventing grace, can assent to or reject it. So far well; but the taint of semi-Pelagianism is seen in the stress which Romanist divines lay on the negative character of original sin, and on the necessity that the absolute will and consent of an intelligent agent should concur to constitute sinfulness before God

Whether the formal teaching of the Council asserted it or not, the current Romanist doctrine denies that men are born into the world with anything subjective in them of the strict nature of sin. The taint also appears in the merit of congruity, as opposed to the subsequent merit of condignity, the co-operator with Divine grace bringing the former to approve him for justification. The doctrine we have established goes far with the Romanist as to the non-imputation of the guilt of inbred sin in the regenerate; but altogether leaves it by asserting that there is inherent and innate evil in every descendant of Adam, that concupiscence, remaining in the believer, is offensive in the sight of God, that it must as sin be abhorred and mourned over, and as sin be put away by human discipline and Divine grace

(2.) In virtue of this principle the true doctrine is opposed also to every account of sin which insists that it cannot be reckoned such by a righteous God save where the will actively consents; and that none can be held responsible for any state of soul or action of life which is not the result of the posture of the will at the time. There is an offending character behind the offending will. In St. John’s definition of sin it is not only transgression, but want of conformity with the law. Our Savior speaks of the evil heart, and of the corrupt tree: and of men as being evil, even when giving good things to their children. To teach that there is no such thing as a sinful state or condition or potentiality is semi-Pelagianism: an error which has deeply infected much modern theology in America and England. Those who have been taught by the Scripture the depths of sin steadfastly refuse to admit this principle. They believe that the race of mankind is ruled by a common generic will, which is averse from God; and that the application of the law only makes the discord manifest. The influence of the Spirit which appeals to the law written in the heart teaches every man who listens to His teaching that he is not only a transgressor of the specific commandment, but a transgressor in himself, and before he knows the law that he transgresses

(3.) In the light of this doctrine the harshest form of Augustinianism is condemned, while the principles of eternal truth which it contains are upheld. That system makes the soul of man passive as a stock or a stone, into which by the act of regeneration the principle of life is infused through a sovereign exertion of electing grace, and takes no account of the preliminaries of goodness which are wrought in man by the selfsame Spirit Who is afterwards the Spirit of regeneration. The notion of "common grace" is a solution that the common sense of mankind will not accept. One of the rebukes which Simon Peter received told him, what God hath cleansed, that call not thou common. 1 ough the manifestations of a better mind which human nature exhibits are not evidences of its thorough cleansing, they are tokens of a cleansing prepared for it. While it is denied that they are good works, it is denied also that they are strictly speaking evil. They are not fruits of the tree of life in man, yet they are not fruits of the corrupt tree as such. But this subject, as well as the function of

the human will in salvation, must be reserved: meanwhile, we must hold fast the deep truth of Bernard’s aphorism; "Tolle liberum arbitrium, non erit quod salvatur. Tolle gratiam, non erit unde salvetur."

1 Acts 10:15

(4.) Finally, the Methodist teaching on this general subject derives its value from its strict conformity with the doctrine with which St. John’s First Epistle closes the Scriptural testimony. In its third chapter we have the fullest and most exhaustive statement of the New Testament as to sin generally, its origin, its nature, its manifestations, and the process of its destruction. The counterpart of St. Paul’s fifth chapter to the Romans, it deals less with the human original of evil, but more with its entire destruction as the design of the manifestation of the Sinless One, and as accomplished in the perfectly regenerate. The purpose of redemption is to take away our sins, 1 according to the good pleasure of the Eternal Love of the Father Who sent His Son, the Propitiation for our sins: 2 not to be or to become, but as already, the Propitiation from heaven. Also for, this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil: 3 He came, not to relax but to fulfill all righteousness; the works of Satan He came to undo and destroy (hina lusee). In St. Paul’s chapter the source of our evil is traced no higher than Adam, and the Fountain opened for our cleansing sends forth its streams parallel with those of the fountain of our defilement. In St. John’s chapter the source is traced still higher, to Satan the sinner from the beginning; and the Redeemer Whom St. Paul makes the Second Adam St. John makes the Antagonist of the Original Enemy of righteousness The whole design of redemption is the abolition of sin as transgression of law: the perfect vindication of law, whether by the judicial satisfaction of its claims or by the restoration of its authority. Neither of the Apostles speaks of the destruction of the works of Satan apart from their operation in man; and neither speaks of any destruction of those works save as accomplished in believing mankind. But, omitting any reference to the vast residuum of Satanic works with which the Judgment will deal, both dwell with deep emphasis on the annihilation of sin in the regenerate. St. John, however, is the more full and explicit. In his doctrine the design of the manifestation of the Son is the entire removal of iniquity from human nature in the present life; and upon this Methodist teaching fastens with strong tenacity. That design is to be wrought out in those who believe, through their conformity with the Savior in Whom is NO SIN. 4 Every man in Christ is to be made righteous, even as He is righteous; 5 to become pure even as He is pure; and, between his justification and his sanctification, the regenerate Christian doth not commit sin; for His seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is begotten of God. Thus, in the Divine court of law, and household, and temple, respectively, the dark history of sin in man has its end. And, despite every argument to the contrary, Methodism holds fast and proclaims this great hope 1 1 John 3:5; 2 1 John 4:10; 3 1 John 3:8; 4 1 John 3:7; 1 John 3:3; 1 John 3:9; 5 1 John 3:5

XI, The Socinians, Modern Unitarians, and Rationalists generally revert to the old Pelagian theory, which is really not a doctrine of original sin, but a denial of it in every form. In rejecting the Scriptural teaching, however, they have no substitute to bring. They admit the facts of human depravity. They cannot deny that evil is universal, and that all the differences among men as its subjects and agents are only differences of degree. They allow that the entire fabric of human legislation and government is based upon the postulate that universal man requires restraint; that all men know and instinctively recognize each other as sinners; that the mortality of the race is not

more confidently presupposed than its bias to evil; that education universally deals with children as having innate or inwrought principles of error; and that, in fact, a deviation from the perfect standard is hereditary in our nature. They can give no account of this that will bear a moment's consideration. The influence of example may explain much, but this of itself demands a reason for the facility with which example is followed. In short, there is no doctrine of our most holy faith which so irresistibly and universally appeals for its confirmation to the common conscience and judgment of mankind. It shines by its own light, though alas its light is as darkness

16. Vol 02 - The Divine Purpose of Redemption

The Divine Purpose of Redemption THE MEDIATORIAL MINISTRY. THE DIVINE PURPOSE OF REDEMPTION THE ETERNAL COUNSEL Origin and Foreannouncement GRADUAL UNFOLDING OF THE ONE COVENANT OF GRACE its Mediator its Three Forms its Dispensations

ACCOMPLISHMENT the Mystery Revealed HISTORICAL REVIEW Ante-Augustinian

Mediaeval

Calvinistic Supralapsarianism and Infralapsarianism

Arminianism

PRELIMINARY. THE most appropriate superscription of the department of Theology on which we now enter is THE MEDIATORIAL MINISTRY. This term defines the relation of our Savior's Person to God and man, separated by human sin: as it is expressed in the word Mediatorial. It embraces also the whole compass of our Saviour's work on earth and in heaven: this is better described by the Lord's own word, Ministry, than by any other. A thorough survey of the subject includes, first, the historical development of the Divine eternal counsel of Redemption as exhibited in a series of dispensations or covenants of which Christ, whether unrevealed or revealed, is the sole Mediator. Secondly, it presents to us the full manifestation of the Mediatorial Trinity: the several functions and relations of the Three Persons in the incarnation and redeeming work. This leads, thirdly, to the Person of Christ as the Mediator, whose Divine personality continues in His assumption of human nature and gives its perfection to all that He does and suffers for mankind. Fourthly, what our Lord accomplished once for all, and is still accomplishing, must be viewed in its historical process through a succession of redeeming states and offices. Fifthly, we close with the study of the Finished Work of His objective mediatorial ministry as distinguished from the subjective application of it in the individual and in the Church through the Holy Ghost. In discussing these topics, the very fundamentals of the Gospel, we must adhere rigidly to the revelations of Scripture. But, in this as in other departments, and perhaps more than most others, it will be necessary as we proceed to study the ecclesiastical development side by side with the Scriptural. THE DIVINE PURPOSE.

We cannot approach the accomplished work of redemption save through the eternal counsel from which it sprang, and the successive dispensations which connected it with that eternal purpose. Before the world existed Christ was ordained to take human nature in order to its renewal; not therefore as a necessary incarnation for the perfecting of the idea of humanity apart from sin. The mystery of the Divine counsel has been gradually unfolded through a series of economies, which occupied the times of preparation for the Gospel. These may be viewed under two aspects. First, the whole world of mankind has been dealt with according to the terms of a covenant dating from the Fall, but not yet fully revealed: a covenant of grace given as a simple promise to our first parents, renewed to Noah, and once more ratified to Abraham, as each the representative of

mankind. This may be called the economy of the Gentiles inasmuch as the world was undergoing a negative preliminary discipline for Christ, the Desire of the nations, and at the same time enjoying a certain measure of benefit from His mediation. Secondly, a series of positive dispensations or covenants were given supernaturally to a chosen people, in which the coming Redeemer was foreshadowed and prepared for: in the Mosaic covenant as the law with its expiations, and as prophecy with its Gospel promise. Both the law and the prophets of the Mosaic economy incorporated and carried on the older promise or decree of redemption until the fullness of time when Christ blended all into the unity of the new covenant. THE ETERNAL DECREE.

Redemption is in the New Testament declared to have been a purpose of God in or from eternity. This design, having reference solely to the Saviour's work, and apart from its application by the Spirit, is regarded in Scripture as an absolute decree of man's salvation virtually accomplished from the beginning: a mystery reserved for gradual revelation, but a reality underlying all human history.

1. By many various terms is the original design of man's salvation set forth. Love is in the van and in the rear of the long array. God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son: 1 here outo and oste mark the design of love as accomplished in the mission of the Only-begotten. 2 That love is viewed as the spontaneous, absolute, decretive will of God: neither taking counsel nor giving account outside of Himself. The counsel of His own will 3 is simply the decree of His supreme volition: the bouleen is the expression of the Theleema; it represents our redemption as the primitive norm or rule according to which God worketh all things, rather than as a scheme or expedient itself evolved in the Divine mind. Those passages which are sometimes quoted in the latter sense refer to the gradual evolution of the heavenly counsel, the conditions on which personal salvation is suspended, and the methods of the Spirit's administration. In regard to these, there is certainly a plan of Salvation, but not so strictly a plan of Redemption: the latter is as simply a fiat of will as creation: Lo, I come to do Thy will, 0 God.4 1 John 3:16; 2 1 John 4:10; 1 John 2:7; 3 Ephesians 1:11; 4 Hebrews 10:9.

2. This decree had its effect in itself and was virtually accomplished: we cannot say from the time of its origination, for it was not a project of time. The fall of the world and its recovery were never separated. The history of mankind is a history of redemption. The Lamb was both foreordained before 1 and slain from the foundation of the world, 2and the virtue of the Atonement, like death, passed through to all men, the heritage of the race. It was the love of God our Savior towardMan 1:3 His filanthroopía, that appeared in Christ as a mystery revealed. And another of St. Paul's last testimonies speaks of God our Savior; who willeth all men to be saved, 4 as proved by the mediatorship of Christ Jesus, Who gave Himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time. Under a decree of redemption virtually accomplished the whole world has lived and moved and had its being. The self-devotion of the One Mediator dated back before He became Christ Jesus Man: 5 His incarnation was the testimony in time of an eternal fact in the Divine counsel.

Man has no history apart from Him.

1 1 Peter 1:20; 2 Revelation 13:8; 3 Titus 3:4; 4 1 Timothy 2:3-4; 1 Timothy 2:6; 5 1 Timothy 2:5. ITS PROGRESSIVE UNFOLDING. The Decree was, however, a mystery slowly revealed, and in a variety of ways: by gradual prophecy and gradual preparation, both of which assumed the form of a series of covenants, or covenant economies.

1. The eternal purpose was preserved in the remembrance and hope of mankind by constant FOREANNOUNCEMENTS. The Gospel was preached from the beginning. The Lord Himself declared it to our fallen parents in words which have therefore been called the PROTEVANGELIUM, or First Gospel. It was said to the serpent: And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her Seed; It shall bruise thy head, and thou shall bruise His heel: 1 this first prediction of a coming Deliverer, Who should undo the work of Satan, went forth into all the world, and was mingled with the traditional hopes of all the nations. It was renewed in the new world to Abraham: In thy Seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed. 2 This promise was given in prospect of the Atonement on the mount, and, like that Atonement, must carry its meaning backward as well as forward: in the Seed of the woman, limited to the stock of Abraham, all nations, not only should be but were and had been already blessed. Again, the Seed was further limited to the line of David, who transmitted to the prophets the decree which was declared to him. Thus the great prophecies which went before on Christ were restricted to one people who received them as their guardians for the world, and those prophecies kept the Oath and the Promise of God with always increasing clearness before the minds of men.

1 Genesis 3:15; 2 Genesis 22:18.

2. There was also a continuous PREPARATION. This was negative in the demonstration of the sin and impotence of the world, whether of Jews or Gentiles: as to the latter, when the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe; 1 as to the former, the law given to them was added because of transgressions, till the Seed should come to Whom the promise was made; they were kept under the law, which was a schoolmaster . . . unto Christ. 2 Hence the great preparation running through the ages is summed up: the Scripture hath concluded all under sin. It was also a positive preparation. The history of the ancient economy was one long arrangement for the manifestation of the redeeming purpose. For that the peculiar people was chosen; for that the holy land was prepared; for that the entire system of typical and symbolical ceremony was ordered; for that both the land and the people were finally given into the hands of the heathen. For of a truth against Thy holy child Jesus, Whom Thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do whatsoever Thy hand and Thy counsel foreordained to come to pass. 3 This first hymn of the Christian Church sings the fulfillment of a decree for which all events had prepared and in the accomplishment of which all the most diversified agents conspired.

1 1 Corinthians 1:21; 2 Galatians 3:19; Galatians 3:23-24; 3 Acts 4:27-28.

3. The gradual development of the Divine counsel of human salvation is in Scripture the unfolding of a COVENANT OF GRACE. Reserving for the present the fuller treatment of this subject in its application to the work of Christ and its administration in the Gospel, we must now fix our thought upon its connection with the history of that development.

(1.) The term itself bears a special Messianic meaning, as always having in view the fidelity of God to the design of human redemption through the sacrifice of His Son. The Hebrew beriyth, almost always translated in the LXX by diatheékee, signifies, not a compact as between man and man, but the Disposition or Arrangement assumed by the One Supreme purpose of grace. It employs analogically the language of human covenants; and is an example of the anthropomorphic mode of speech which expresses the Divine dealings with our race, in Christ the Mediator. Unlike human

compacts it is invariably connected with sacrifice. The original Hebrew word is derived from barah or bara, in allusion to the custom of cutting and passing between the parts of a divided animal on the ratification of a covenant: hence the Greek orkia temnein, and the Hebrew bariyt kaarat. The first express revelation of the covenant to Abraham gives the key to all its history. There all is based on a free Divine promise. 1 The animals divided denoted the two parties to the great transaction; and the flame passing through was God, in His future Son, the Shekinah, uniting the parties alone, and thus ratifying His own covenant. The New-Testament term diatheékee does not preserve the original allusion; but it is never disconnected from the idea. The one covenant of grace has been ratified by an eternal sacrifice; which is at the same time the death of the Testator,2 who disposes the promise of eternal inheritance according to the counsel of His own will.

1 Genesis 15:18; 2 Hebrews 9:16; Hebrews 9:15.

(2.) This covenant of redemption or of grace has been always connected with Christ its unrevealed Mediator. As its MEDIATOR or mesítous, He is the medium through Whom or rather in Whom all its blessings are conveyed: that GRACE, which is the one name and one blessing of the covenant, the free bestowment of favor on sinful man, or the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. 1 Therefore the term, which has a wider meaning than its relation to a compact, may be applied to Christ as the yet unknown Redeemer who was at once the ground of the covenant, and its promise, and its virtual administrator. After He came and was revealed, it is the term SURETY or egguos that more precisely expresses His mediatorship in the order of grace: in His Divine-human atoning personality He is the Pledge to man of the bestowment by God of all blessings procured through His atoning work, and the Pledge to God on the part of mankind of compliance with all the conditions of the covenant. In the Old Testament the future Redeemer is not termed either the Mediator or the Surety; though He was in the profoundest sense both as the Angel or Messenger of the Covenant, 2 and Himself the embodied Covenant reserved for the future: I will preserve Thee, and give Thee for a covenant of the people, 3 having all its blessings committed to Him as a great Promise for the last days. What was thus given to Him by promise becomes the heritage of His people through faith, who as Christ’s are heirs according to the promise.4 1 Hebrews 7:22; 2 Malachi 3:1; 3 Isaiah 49:8; 4 Galatians 3:18-19; Galatians 3:29.

(3.) This one Covenant has taken three forms in the history of revelation, (i.) As entered into with mankind, represented by Christ, its revelation began with the Fall, was ratified for the world with Noah, and was confirmed to Abraham, as the representative of all believers to the end of time, (ii.) But the covenant with Abraham for the world in all ages also introduced the special compact with his descendants after the flesh. This latter was established through Moses its mediator; and blended the covenant of grace with a covenant of works. The law was given by Moses; 1 and, as an appended form or condition of the original institute of grace, perpetually convicted the people of their sin and impotence, drove them to take refuge in the hope of a future grace, the ground of which was kept before them in the institute of sacrifice, (iii.) Finally, the New Covenant, established upon better promises, 2 was ratified in the death of Christ. It was at once the abrogation of the Mosaic or later Old Covenant, so far as concerns its national relation and its legal condition, and the renewal unto perfection of the more ancient covenant, always in force and never superseded, with mankind: of which more particularly hereafter.

1 John 1:17; 2 Hebrews 8:6.

(4.) This one institute of mercy, as progressively revealed, distributes the history of revelation under a series of DISPENSATIONS, which are sometimes called the Patriarchal, the Mosaic, and the Christian. Dispensation and Economy are translations of the one word oikonomia: the former referring rather to the degrees of the Divine bestowment, and the latter to the various forms it has assumed in the arrangements of the one Church. In relation to this, the documents of the former economies are called, after the precedent of the Mosaic book of the covenant, 1 the books of the Old Covenant or Testament, and those of the last dispensation, the New Covenant or Testament. But it must always be remembered that through these dispensations the virtue of the one covenant of grace flowed. They were all preliminary and imperfect, but substantially effectual, revelations of the Gospel. Grace reigned through righteousness in every age. All who have been saved, have been saved through the Atonement, unrevealed or revealed. And in this sense we may add to the series above given a GENTILE dispensation, of which something has already been said, and more will be said hereafter.

1 Exodus 25:7.

ACCOMPLISHMENT. The Divine Purpose was fulfilled in the Mission of Christ, including His incarnation and death: the Decree, that is, of the redemption of the world. This fulfillment is the fullness of time; its consummate secret being the ratification of the new and better covenant: new, in contradistinction to the old which was in its final form limited to one people; and better, because revealing all the provisions of grace, for time and eternity, in Christ the Mediator made perfect, on behalf of the entire race of mankind.

1. Our Lord's advent introduced the last days, 1 or the dispensation of the fullness of times,2 or the economy of the mystery (oikonomian tou musteerion riou), 3 or the fulfillment of the promise which was made unto the fathers, 4 or the revelation of the mystery5 . . . made known to all nations for the obedience of faith. 6 Everything in the coming of Christ had its end. The entire current of New-Testament revelation glorifies God in the full manifestation of the Eternal Purpose for the salvation of the human race. The LAST DAYS are in the Epistle to the Hebrews connected with perfected Revelation: God hath in these last days spoken unto us in His Son; 8 in St. Peter's First Epistle with the revelation of the Atonement: the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times; 7 and in the Pentecostal sermon with the outpouring of the Spirit: It shall come to pass m the last days, saith God, I will pour out of My Spirit upon all flesh. 9 But in all these three summary instances the accomplishment of a Divine decree of redemption is in the context. What was set forth to Himself in the Divine mind was set forth on the scene of human history in the Passion of Christ. This is the sense of St. Paul's classical passage on the subject: where we have the ETERNAL COUNSEL 10 (on proetheto), set forth or proposed to Himself by God; the gradual WITNESS OF THE LAW AND PROPHETS, on the one hand, and, on the other, the pretermission of sins in the Divine FORBEARANCE AS YET UNACCOUNTED FOR; and, lastly, the NOW of the Gospel times, with the full revelation of the objective and subjective Redemption. This is the emphatic doctrine of those other words: When the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son . . . to redeem them that were under the law, 11 where ina must have its full force. The Son was sent to accomplish a predetermined design. And the new

covenant is spoken of as a finished transaction. The days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant: 12 instead of the diatheékeen of the Septuagint we read suntelesoo and will complete or bring to perfection. It is not that which decayeth and waxeth old.

1 Hebrews 1:2; 2 Ephesians 1:10; 3 Galatians 4:4; 4 Ephesians 3:9; 5 Acts 13:33; Acts 13:32; 6 Romans 16:25-26; 7 1 Peter 1:20; 8 Hebrews 1:2; 9 Acts 2:17; 10 Romans 3:21; 11 Gal. 4:4 12 Hebrews 8:8; Hebrews 8:13.

2. It must be remembered, however, that this fulfillment refers only to the objective work of redemption. The great purpose was accomplished, and the Divine counsel exhausted, in the Tetelestai, It is finished. In the death of the Mediator there was a fulfillment of the one great promise on which all others were suspended. The supreme secret of the ages was made manifest. The mystery of the Gospel, or the mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, 1 being the mystery of Christ, 2 or, as elsewhere, the mystery of God, Christ,3 was in one sense a mystery no longer, though in another sense to remain for ever such a mystery as the angels desire to look into.4 1 Ephesians 6:19; 2 Ephesians 3:4; Ephesians 3:9; 3 Colossians 2:2; 4 1 Peter 1:12.

3. It is also true that the purpose still runs on, waiting for another accomplishment, which connects it with the Spirit's work in the administration of redemption. Often the accomplished purpose of human salvation is confounded with the final realization of all the Divine Plans. We must endeavor to keep these two distinct. The language of the New Testament when speaking of the actualization of the Divine decree in the mission of Christ is different from that which is used concerning the gradual fulfillment of other purposes dependent upon that. However difficult it may be to make the distinction it is necessary. The processes of the gradual administration of grace will issue in the salvation of a certain portion of mankind, according as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world. 1 But the gradual gathering of the elect, and the gradual salvation of each of the number, is represented as the result of a plan and method in the Gospel.

Whereas of the redemption of man's race or mankind, that is, of all who have ever borne or shall ever bear the name' of man, the Scripture speaks in definitive terms as having been once for all accomplished. We have seen—said the last writer in the last document— and do testify that the Father sent the Son, the Savior of the world: and not only to be the Savior.2 1 Ephesians 1:4; 2 1 John 4:14.

HISTORICAL.

1. The Nicene Creed expresses the sentiment of the first Christians, that Jesus Christ was incarnate FOR us MEN AND FOR OUR SALVATION, DI HMAS TOUS ANTHROPOUS; and that the Divine purpose united redemption and creation. So Athanasius: " The Restitution could take place only in that the original Pattern after which man was created was manifested for his salvation." A long series of divines, from Irenseus to the present day, assume that the Incarnation would have taken place if man had not sinned; an opinion of speculative theology which disturbs the free grace of the eternal counsel.

2. The early Church held fast the universality of the object of the redeeming purpose. From the Apostolical Fathers downwards there is a clear testimony. " Ideo autem passus est, ut tolleret peccatum mundi. Si quis autem non credit in Christum, generali beneficio se fraudat." These

words of Ambrose represent the strain of ante-Nicene theology, which knew nothing of a restriction in the Divine purpose of salvation.

3. But his disciple Augustine did not follow his teacher. He first laid down the principle that God in His sovereignty decreed the separation of a certain number from the mass of fallen mankind unto salvation, including the special, irresistible, and inadmissible grace that leads to it: for them and for them alone He provided and sent His Son. This view of the eternal purpose was exaggerated by the followers of Augustine; it gave rise to Pelagian and semi-Pelagian extravagance in the opposite direction. Early Augustinianism made grace dependent on the prodestination of its object; semi-Pelagianism made grace dependent on the Divine prevision of man's good use of it. The Synod of Arausio rejected both, and at the same time condemned " cum omni detestatione," the doctrine of a predestination to evil; and that of Chiercy (853) under Hincmar spoke still more decidedly. The ninth century was full of this controversy, Gottschalk being the representative of Augustine, and the link between him and his still greater representative, Calvin.

4. The Scholastic divines took opposite sides as to the Divine decrees: Thomas of Bradwardine, Archbishop of Canterbury (1349), and Wyclif after him, prepared the way for the rigorous doctrine which Calvin stamped with his name. But the general tendency of mediaeval doctrine was towards the universal redemption which the Council of Trent laid down, and from which the Greek Church had never deviated.

5. Calvin carried the ancient theory of Augustine to its logical conclusion: cadit homo Dei providentia SIC ORDINANTE, sed suo vitio cadit. This is SUPRALAPSARIANISM: the doctrine that God predestined the fall of the race as well as the salvation of some to the glory of His grace and the reprobation of others to the glory of His justice.

INFRALAPSARIANISM seems to have been the accepted method of putting' the dogma of Augustine: it modifies the former so far as to connect the fall with God's silent permission, instead of His foreordination. But the admission of this distinction goes far towards the subversion of Augustinianism. It renounces the absolute Sovereignty, which cannot consist with a mere permission to fall; the whole system is dissolved when the iron bonds of Sovereignty are withdrawn. Accordingly, many of the Reformed have sought to mitigate in various ways their master's severe dogma. France, especially, Calvin's own country, made desperate attempts to shake itself free from the yoke. What has been known as the theory of HYPOTHETICAL REDEMPTION originated in Saumur with Amyraut (1664). Its watchword was the DECRETUM UNIVERSALE HYPOTHETICUM: that is, Christ has made the salvation of all men possible if they believe; but, though the Son's intervention is of universal value, God's efficacious grace is given only to a certain number. This unhappy compromise has found advocates in England also.

6. The Remonstrants of Holland, or Arminians, were the first who, in modern times, protested against the Augustinianism which had found its way into some of the Formularies of the Reformation. Their principle was that the decree of God in Christ was in favor of mankind as such; and that that decree was accomplished in the offering of Christ for the redemption of the whole race. The Lutheran Formularies, especially the later, assert the same universality; as also do the Methodists everywhere. Against this Calvinism or Augustinianism urges that the decree of redemption was in favor only of those who are actually redeemed; that redemption in purpose had not and could not have reference to those who perish; and that, if general appeals and

exhortations are found in the Word of God, this anomaly is to be explained by the fact that there is a secret decree behind the open declaration of the Divine Purpose.

7. It is obvious that inscrutable mystery rests upon this whole subject. Its chief difficulty, however, lies in the Scriptural application of the doctrines of vocation and election in their connection with general redemption. In other words, while the eternal will of the Love of God to provide a Deliverer and an atoning deliverance adequate to meet the ruin of mankind is placed beyond the possibility of doubt, the revelation of the Bible thus responding to the instinct of the human heart, it may seem hard to reconcile such a catholic purpose with the partial, progressive, and limited announcements of that supreme truth. But this branch of the subject has its appropriate place hereafter; and it will receive fuller treatment.

17. Vol 02 - The Redemptional or Economical Trinity

The Redemptional or Economical Trinity THE REDEMPTIONAL OR ECONOMICAL TRINITY Unity of Triune Purpose Covenant of Redemption Absolute and Redemptional Trinity Relation of the Three Persons of the Father of the Son of the Spirit

Subordination The gradual unfolding of the mystery of redemption is also the gradual unfolding of the mystery of the Triune God. While the Divine essence is revealed as unity of nature in trinity of personal subsistence, the work of human salvation is so related to the Triunity and to the several Persons that the Redemptional Trinity may be made a topic of separate discussion: with the reservation, however, that the Economical Trinity is only the Absolute Trinity as manifested in the present dispensation, and that all the New- Testament exhibitions of it are to be interpreted accordingly. We have to consider, first, the common relation of the Triune Godhead to the Mediatorial Work, and then the relation of each Person: both in the light of Scripture alone

I, The redemption of mankind sprang from the eternal purpose of God the Triune: Let Us redeem man! was silently one with Let Us make man! God is not divided. As the creation is a Divine work, while each Person is Creator, so redemption is a Divine work in which the Three Persons unite. God . . . hath visited and redeemed His people: 1 words to the Jews which the Apostle confirms: After that the . . . love of God our Savior toward man appeared. 2 These are the key to all those passages which connect God absolutely and independently of the hypostatic distinctions with our salvation, down to the end: God shall be all in all,3 the TRIUNE GOD. From this some inferences follow 1 Luke 1:68; 2 Titus 3:4; 3 1 Corinthians 15:28

1. The Divine attributes that required and provided an atonement are the attributes of the Three Persons: no distinction can be admitted between the holiness and love of the Father and the holiness and love of the Son. There is a perfect perichoorosis in the Redemptional Trinity, even as there is in the Absolute. I and my Father are One is a testimony that may be carried higher than the foundation of the world

1 John 10:30

2. Hence there is no support for the theory of a COVENANT OF REDEMPTION between the Father and the Son, according to which the Three Persons concerted the plan of salvation: the Son undertaking on His part to undergo the penalties of the law for His people, and the Father pledging Himself to give the Son His own glory and His people’s souls as His recompense, and the Spirit witnessing in order to administer this covenant. The Scripture speaks only of the will and purpose of God’s love to redeem mankind, which will was the will of the undivided Trinity. The sayings of the Word of God on this subject do not sustain the representations sometimes made of a harmony effected between the mercy and the justice of the Father through the intervention of the Son in the eternal Trinity before the world was. The reconciliation of those attributes must indeed be regarded as preceding the manifested work of redemption; the Atonement was a reality in the Divine mind before it was accomplished on the cross. But it was not an Atonement offered to one

Person in the Trinity by Another and witnessed by a Third. The Son Incarnate came to do the will of God: His own will, and the will of the Holy Ghost, as much as the will of the Father. The words Covenant, and Scheme, and Plan belong to the manifestations of the redeeming economy in time. We must not transfer them to eternity. There is an impenetrable veil over what is so often called the Council of the eternal Trinity; and the Scripture does not take our thoughts behind it: save only when the Son speaks of a glory which He had with the Father before the world was, and His disciple of an atonement foreordained before the foundation of the world. 1 When another writer introduces the actual atonement the pro katabolees becomes apo katabolees: not before the foundation but from the foundation of the world was the Lamb slain. 2 Now a mediator is not a mediator of one; but God is One: 3 if such an application of St. Paul's hard saying may be permitted. No interior mediation, in the strict sense of the term can be conceived within the Godhead 1 1 Peter 1:20; 2 Revelation 13:8; 3 Galatians 3:20 II. The Three Persons of the Trinity are revealed in most strict and definite relations to the economy of redemption

1. These relations are so clearly defined that it is necessary at the outset to show that the Scriptural doctrine of the Trinity is really independent of the work of Christ. The Three Persons are connected with creation almost as closely as with redemption; in this economical, though not as yet redemptional, Trinity the Word or the Son is the Agent of the Father's creating will; and the Spirit connects the Father and the Son with the visible universe. The same names are given to the Son and Spirit in their pre-temporal being as are given to them in the dispensation of grace in time. The Word who was with God in the beginning 1 was made flesh; 2 and His Divinity is the Spirit in which His oblation was offered. The baptismal formula conjoins the Son and not the Son incarnate with the Father in the unity of the Holy Ghost. 3 In the mystery of the internal relations there was the eternal possibility of the Absolute Trinity becoming the Redemptional: there is no deeper or more adorable secret in the Christian Faith than this. The Father could send the Son, while the Son could give Himself; and the Holy Ghost, neither the Sender nor the Incarnate Sent, could in His distinct personality rest upon the Son made flesh, and be the Minister to Him who ministered to us 1 John 1:2; 2 Hebrews 9:14; 3 Matthew 28:19

2. This being so, there is a never-failing consistency in the exhibitions of the Redemptional Trinity as distinguished from the Absolute

(1.) The eternal generation of the Son is the ground of the generation by which the Son was made flesh. The words This day have I begotten Thee 1 cannot refer either to eternity or to the resurrection of the Lord's human nature: they express the profound truth that the Only-begotten was now the same eternal Son begotten again in our human nature: this day being the one day of the incarnation finished and made perfect in the resurrection

Hence the Father of this Incarnate Son in the Mediatorial Trinity is always the supreme Representative of the Godhead. God and the Father are terms used interchangeably: St John says that God sent His Son and immediately afterwards The Father sent theSong of Solomon 2:1-17 This is a law of phraseology which may be traced through the New Testament. The entire economy of redemption is always referred to God or to the Father as its origin, fountain, and head. What belongs to all the Persons of the Absolute Trinity alike is in the Trinity Redemptional assigned to the Father alone. Hence He receives the doxology of the Church, and prayer is generally offered to Him 1 Acts 13:33; 2 1 John 4:10-14

(2.) And the Spirit never assumes any relation to the person and work of Christ, but that of One Who, consubstantial with the Father and the Son, is yet the Agent of the will of the mediatorial Father. The Double Generation is taught in Scripture; and analogy would be almost enough to establish the Double Procession as the ground of the Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost. He is always sent forth: Himself like Christ an apostslos.1 Before the Incarnation He prepared the way of the Lord, as the Spirit of the Christ. 2 In the miraculous conception, He is the Agent by Whom the Father begets His Incarnate Son, and by Whom the Son partook of our flesh and blood. 3 During the Saviour's ministry He presides over all its processes as the Intermediary between the Son and His Father: precisely as if He were the Director and Disposer of a passive Christ. It was through the Holy Ghost that our Lord had given commandments unto the Apostles. 4 Even after the ascension the Spirit in the redemptional Trinity is still the Agent of the Father sent by the Son, and never is represented as independently revealing Himself. But to the Holy Spirit in His administration we must again refer 1 Hebrews 3:1; 2 1 Peter 1:12; 3 Hebrews 2:14; 4 Acts 1:2

(3.) As to the Son incarnate His place in the Holy Trinity is for a season merged in His mediatorial relation to God and His Father. He Himself never swerves from the language of subordination. Even in those sayings which, as it were, undesignedly manifest forth His Divine glory, there is still the recognition of the Father's will which He has come into the world to finish, and a perpetual remembrance of the obedience which He must learn But of the Redeemer's humbled estate it is not needful to say more now. Suffice that throughout the entire economy of redemption, and until the end when the Triune God shall be all in all, and the mediatorial distinctions of office in the Trinity cease, the predominant character of the Second Person is and will be that of Mediator, through whom we draw nigh to God: under the authority of the Father, and having the Holy Spirit under Him. The last Gospel, which is the most distinctively Trinitarian, is also the most express on this subject. Its earlier chapters exhibit Him under authority; of which such passages as these are specimens: as the Living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father, 1 when the mediatorial life is signified; for I came down from heaven, not to do Mine own will, but the will of Him that sent Me.1 Its later chapters show that the Spirit is under Him; He had always spoken before of Himself as declaring what He was ever hearing of the Father, as I hear IJudges 2:1-23 and now He uses the very same language of the Spirit in relation to Himself: whatever He shall hear that shall He speak . . . for He shall receive of Mine. 3 And intermediately we hear Him declaring the absolute unity between the Father and the Son: I and My Father are One.4 1 John 6:57; John 6:38; 2 John 5:30; 3 John 15:13-14; 4 John 10:30 3. It is important to remember this truth in the study of the mediatorial economy

Illustrations will hereafter be given of what needs now only to be stated: that, with certain occasional reservations and saving clauses which abundantly declare the supreme Divinity of the Son and the Spirit, the general strain of the phraseology of the New Testament represents the Second and Third Persons of the Trinity in their economical subordination to the Father as the representative of the Godhead. It must always be borne in mind that the theology of the Bible is the theology of redemption: before the application of this principle that peculiar difficulty which springs from the comparative rarity of direct allusions to the Trinity as such vanishes. In fact the difficulty becomes a help to faith when it is looked at in this light. The sublime theory of a redemptional subordination of the Two Persons is maintained, generally and down to the minutest detail, with an exact consistency of which only Divine wisdom could be the author

18. Vol 02 - The Person of Christ

The Person of Christ THE PERSON OF CHRIST THE DIVINE PERSONALITY OF THE INCARNATE

Divine Names

Two Natures Divine and Human, united in the description of the Incarnate Person His Humanity Flesh His Godhead Spirit Divine Attributes and Worship THE DIVINE SON the Eternal Sonship, Continued in the Incarnation Unity of the Person of the Son for ever THE PERFECT MANHOOD Without Defect and without Excess Sinless Development THE DIVINE-HUMAN PERSON or Hypostatic Union Scriptural Formulas of Indivisible Person its Unity Abiding Distinction of Natures DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE OF ONE PERSONALITY IN SCRIPTURE ECCLESIASTICAL DEVELOPMENT

Early Errors Ebionites Precursors of Modern Unitarianism, Nazarenes of Socinians Monachianism of Second Century Gnostic Heresies assailing both Divinity and Humanity Arianism and Apollinarianism dishonouring the Divine and the Human Natures respectively Nestorianism and Eutychianism affecting the Union of Natures as such Chalcedonian Formula Later Development

Monophysitism

Adoptianism The dogma of the Person of Christ has not been always defined and limited with sufficient strictness. It is the formal statement of what the Scripture teaches concerning the indivisible unity of the two natures in the One Christ. It is not therefore the doctrine of our Lord’s Divinity as such, though that is included. Nor is it the doctrine of His perfect Manhood as such, though that also is involved. It simply treats of the Person resulting from the union as Divine-human or Incarnate. The Word of God does not assign a term to this union which might indicate its nature: it does not use the expression Person of Christ, any more than it uses that of Trinity. But the former has the same relation to the Redeemer that the latter has to the Triune Essence. Sometimes those who do justice to the distinct dogma of the Person of Christ enlarge it unduly: including in it much that belongs to the Estates and Offices of Christ as the Subject of an historical development. It will be well to confine our present topic to the Divine Personality of the Son who assumes our nature, to the verity of the human nature which He assumes, and to the Divine-human Person, with its new and eternal composite personality, which is the result. Whatever does not fairly come within this scope must be referred to a subsequent stage The doctrine of the undivided and indivisible unity of the Incarnate Person is taught by the Holy Ghost in two ways: first, by the language used concerning the Christ, and, secondly, by the ascription of the virtue and qualities of each of the two natures to the Saviour’s work. As to the former: while neither of the two natures ever gives its attributes to the other, the one common Person is clothed with both classes of attributes interchangeably. As to the latter: in all that the Savior does and suffers each nature has its distinct functions unconfounded, while both are the functions of the one common Person, whose Divine personality gives them Divine virtue: some are Divine, some

human; but all are Divine-human. These general truths were anciently summed up as follows: Christ is truly God, perfectly Man, unconfusedly in two Natures, indivisibly in one Person Later developments of dogma pursue the subject into a multitude of subtitles which have made no real advancement towards the solution of what remains THE MYSTERY OF GOD EVEN CHRIST THE DIVINE PERSONALITY

God became incarnate as the Second Person of the Deity. Hence the sole, continuous, abiding, and everlasting personality of the One Christ is that of the Eternal Son, who retains His unchangeable Godhead in His human estate, throughout His mediatorial history, and for ever. Christ is Divine; His Divinity is that of the Son; and it is the personality of the Son which is the Subject in the act and issues of the incarnation

DIVINE The Divinity of the Son eternal in the essence of God has been already established: now we have to do with the Divinity of the Son in the Person of Christ. As incarnate the Redeemer is called by Divine names; His mediatorial relation supposes His truly Divine nature, which is ascribed to Him in connection with human, and as distinguished from it; and the Divine attributes are ascribed to Him, with the homage which those attributes demand

I. In some passages—few, but among the clearest in the New Testament—the Redeemer in His human manifestation is called GOD. And in a larger number He is called LORD, with all the meaning of the ancient JEHOVAH in the term. In a still larger number He bears the third of the early designations of the Deity, ADONAI or Lord: that is, in all those wherein the term Lord is not the representative of Jehovah, but indicates only the jurisdiction over all things which is given to the Eternal Son. It needs hardly to be said that neither the term GOD, nor the term LORD as Jehovah, ever defines in Scripture a dignity conferred on Christ

1. The New Testament begins by applying to Jesus the prediction of Immanuel, 1which being interpreted is, God with us. 2 And the light of fulfillment thrown back upon the same prediction shows that the Incarnate Son is the mighty God. 3 So with regard to the forty-fifth Psalm: Thy throne, 0 God, is for ever and ever, 4which the Epistle to the Hebrews refers to the Incarnate Mediator. 5 In the beginning of his Gospel St. John speaks of the Word made flesh as God, and, in the best reading, as God Only-begotten; 6 he also gives prominence to the confession of Thomas: My Lord and my God. 7 Two passages are doubtful: the church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood, 8 may be perhaps read the church of the Lord. God manifest in the flesh is rather Who was manifest. 9 But it is scarcely permissible to read otherwise than that Christ is over all, God blessed for ever. 10 And the closing testimony of St. Paul is that Christians look for the appearance of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ. 11 These are only a few texts; but their fewness is in their favor as evidence. The mediatorial economy is based on a subordination of the Son Incarnate; and the name God is given to Christ only in occasional ascriptions serving to protect the eternal truth which, for a season, seems of necessity veiled, and therefore liable to perversion

1 Isaiah 7:14; 2 Matthew 1:23; 3 Isaiah 9:6; 4 Psalms 45:6; 5 Hebrews 1:8; 6 John 1:1; John 1:18; 7 John 20:28; 8 Acts 20:28; 9 1 Timothy 3:16; 10 Romans 9:5; 11 Titus 2:13

2. The Incarnate is JEHOVAH; and His name of LORD, not always, but sometimes, is therefore the name of His highest supremacy, attributing to Him an essential and necessary Divine being.

Here again, and for the same reason, the instances are only occasional. Perhaps, with the exception of Thomas's confession, which as it were prepared the way for what follows - the link between the confession of the Gospel days and that of the Epistles—it was not assigned to our Lord until after His ascension. The prayer of the church of the ten-days' interval was to Jehovah Christ: Thou, LORD, which knowest the hearts of all men, show whether of these two Thou hast chosen. 1 St Stephen's testimony, strongest in death, is LORD Jesus, receive my spirit. 2 Believers were baptized in the name of the LORD Jesus, 3 and afterwards call on this name. 4 The Evangelists abound in fulfillments of Scripture which imply that the Jehovah of creation and promised redemption in the Old Testament is Christ in His mediatorial Person. Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth. 5 The Baptist prepared the way of Jehovah, 6 that is, of Christ. The prophet Isaiah saw the glory of the Lord: he saw His glory, 7 that of Christ. St. James terms Him the Lord of glory. 8 He is the New- Testament prophet, the King of kings and Lord of lords. This passage, however, may be classed with St. Peter's sublime parenthesis He is Lord of all, and St. Paul's To us there is . . . one Lord, as the transition from the Jehovah of absolute lordship to the Adonai of as it were delegated authority. In the great majority of passages, with which we have not now to do, Christ is Lord in the sense of an exalted Divine-human representative of Divine authority over all things. These passages unite the two in one. But, it may be said that even these texts of a delegated lordship proclaim the Divinity of Jesus: even as the Adonai of the Old Testament was equally with Jehovah a Divine name 1 Acts 1:24; 2 Acts 7:59; 3 Acts 8:16; 4 Acts 9:21; 5 Hebrews 1:10; 6 Matthew 3:3; 7 Isaiah 6:1; 8 James 2:1

3. The Incarnate is JEHOVAH AND GOD. He Himself did not assume these titles, for a reason that will hereafter be more fully seen. But He so spake as to give matter of pondering which would ripen in due time into a full faith in His Divinity: as, for instance, when He said that wherever His disciples might meet, there am I in the midst of them,1 I AM; before Abraham was, 2 I AM. And He kept silence also when these terms were ascribed to Him: His silence was His acceptance. Perhaps the grandest testimony to the Savior is that given Him by His most doubting disciple: My LORD AND MY GOD, 3 which was meant to express, and accepted as meant to express, the homage of his soul to the Jehovah and God, the Searcher of hearts, the Witness of all human secrets, and the Savior of the most guilty and undeserving of men. This was the last public confession, at least of any individual; and it gave the note of all subsequent New-Testament homage. Of the two supreme names which sprang from the lips of Thomas only one was currently used, and that one capable of a lower meaning: the reason of this belongs to the subject of our Lord's mediatorial subordination 1 Matthew 18:20; 2 John 8:58; 3 John 20:28

II. As Mediator between God and man Christ is necessarily Divine. Having all that belongs to the one represented nature, He must also have all that belongs to the other

What His mediatorial work required His mediatorial Person supplies: perfect equality and oneness with both parties between whom He mediates. And the best demonstration of the Divinity of the incarnate Redeemer is to be found in the passages which exhibit His two natures in their combination and unity. Of these there are several classes; but we must limit ourselves to those which in express words unite while they distinguish the Divine and human natures, after the incarnation. This excludes, for the present, Old-Testament predictions, the testimonies at the incarnation, and even the indirect allusions of our Lord and His Apostles: these will be referred to when the one personality is the subject. In fact, we have only for our appeal the three Apostles

who are the pillars of Christological doctrine

1. St. Paul distinguishes in the Person of Christ the Flesh and the Spirit; the higher and the lower natures: born of the seed of David according to the flesh; and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness. 1 That the Divine nature of Christ should be termed Spirit is what might be expected: God is a Spirit: 2 Now the Lord is that Spirit. 3 He Who was manifest in the flesh was justified in the Spirit.4 The same distinction virtually occurs in the Epistle to the Hebrews, though the human nature is referred to only by implication: through the eternal Spirit 5Christ offered His blood. St Peter also uses the same antithesis: Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit.6 1 Romans 1:3-4; 2 John 4:24; 3 2 Corinthians 3:17; 4 1 Timothy 3:16; 5 Hebrews 9:14; 6 1 Peter 3:18

2. St. Paul also makes the antithesis the Flesh and God: of Whom as concerning thefleshChrist came, Who is over all, God blessed for ever. To this might be added the mystery that God was manifest in the flesh; 1 but the reading Who was manifest is preferred, and the antithesis is in the Spirit that follows. 2 He also conjoins while he distinguishes the Divine Being Who was in the form of God and equal with God 3 and the likeness of men which He assumed 1 Romans 9:5; 2 1 Timothy 3:16; 3 Php 2:6

3. Both St. John and St. Paul collocate the two natures as that of the Son of God and Flesh. God sent His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh. St. John in his Gospel adds the designation Word: And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father). And in his first Epistle Jesus Christ come in the flesh is, as the context shows, the Son of God manifested

4. To these might be added many other passages in which the two natures are collocated by implication: such, for instance, as those indirect statements in which our Lord was wont to indicate both His heavenly and His earthly origin. These, however, must be reserved for the present; as they will be used to illustrate the unity of His person in the two natures. It is better to fix attention upon the comparatively few texts in which the Person of the Incarnate is resolved into its two elements. These are probably the best and most obvious demonstrations of the Divinity of our Lord; and that for two reasons. In the first place, they clearly manifest the design of the writers to give prominence to the distinction; and, by so doing, to assert the reality of the Godhead while the manhood is asserted. In other passages the supreme dignity of the Redeemer is only taken for granted, and impresses its stamp upon the texture of the language. But in these the set purpose to declare His Divinity is plain. Secondly, they bring that Divinity into formal and express connection with the one person of the Christ, thus obviating the double danger against which we have so often to guard our thoughts: the resolution of Christ into two distinct persons, on the one hand, and, on the other, the tendency to fuse the two natures into one new nature as well as person, neither God nor man

III. The incarnate Person is invested with Divine attributes and receives Divine honor. It will hereafter be seen what the limitation of this is, and the reason of this limitation. But, apart from and behind the reserve of our Lord’s humbled estate, and bursting through the veil of His self-humiliation, there are evidences most ample of His Divine attributes, and of the honor paid to Him and accepted by Him which only God can claim

1. It is enough to show that every class of the Divine perfections finds its representative in Him: in other words, that the Divinity which has been already established is such in the full sense of the word, and not a divinity subordinate and impaired. Nothing that pertains to the notion of God is wanting in the ascriptions to Christ as manifest in the flesh. The absolute attributes of God are His: spirituality and eternity of existence especially, as He is the eternal Spirit, 1 and the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever, 2 and the Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last. 3 The relative attributes, such as Omnipresence, Omniscience, Omnipotence, Wisdom, and Goodness, are asserted of Him even in His earthly condition, and much more in His exaltation: He is addressed as knowing the hearts of all men 4 as the Omniscient, has all power, 5 is the Wisdom of God in 6 Whom all its treasures are hid. 7 And the attributes which connect God with the moral universe are His in the unity of the Father: He is the Holy One, and the Just, 8 and His Love, which passeth knowledge, 9 is always dwelt upon as entirely co-ordinate with the love of the Father: the same in its eternal depth, in the object it contemplates, and in the means it uses

1 Hebrews 9:14; 2 Hebrews 13:8; 3 Revelation 1:11; Revelation 21:6; 4 Acts 1:24; 5 Hebrews 1:1-2; 6 1 Corinthians 1:24; 7 Colossians 2:3; 8 Acts 3:14; 9 Ephesians 3:19

2. The worship and honor due to the one God our Lord as incarnate was ordained to receive: He claims it for Himself; and that it is given Him we have ample proofs derived from every part of the New Testament

(1.) Let all the angels of God worship Him! 1 He commands who again bringeth in the Firstborn into the world. They had worshipped Him before, for He was the Son upholding all things by the word of His power. At the incarnation they adored the God Only-begotten made manifest in the flesh; and throughout His history their ministry was the ministry of adoration. But it was to the church of mankind that the ancient command was given: He is thy Lord, and worship thou Him! Him Whom the Father addressed as on His throne: Thy throne, 0 God, is for ever and ever.2 1 Hebrews 1:6; 2 Psalms 45:11; Psalms 45:6

(2.) Our Lord claims an honor due only to God. He claims it throughout His life and ministry by the silent majesty of His Divine character, by His wonderful works literally wrought in God, 1 and by the plain declaration that the Father committed to Him, the Son of man, all judgment, that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father.2 And He who taught afresh the first and great commandment required of His disciples perfect self-sacrificing love to Himself, which is the fulfilling of worship as well as of law. He accepted all kinds of homage from all kinds of worshippers: already on earth; and still more above, from things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth.3 1 John 3:21; 2 John 5:23; 3 Php 2:10

(3.) Accordingly, there is literally no reserve in the supreme homage paid Him by His servants. He is invoked as God for His Benediction, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ;1 He receives as God the Doxology: over all, God blessed for ever;2 to Him be glory both now and for ever. 3 The last book of Scripture gives the exalted Son the same tribute that the Father receives. But the best evidence is the unbounded homage, devotion, loyalty, and love that are concentred on the Person of Christ throughout the Epistles: Whom having not seen, ye love; in whom, though now ye see Him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory. 4 Such love could be given only to God and only God could inspire such joy, 1 2 Corinthians 13:14; 2 Romans 9:5; 3 2 Peter 3:18; 4 1 Peter 1:8 THE SON

While the Incarnate Person is the God-man, or manifestation of God in the flesh, the Divine personality is only that of the Son, the Second Person in the Trinity. As a distinct Person in the Godhead He brings the entire Divine nature into humanity, and continues His eternal personality through all the processes of His development and mediatorial work for ever

I. Into the mystery of the eternal distinction in the Deity which rendered it possible that the Father should send and the Son be sent we dare not enter. Nor into that of the intercommunion by which the whole Divine nature is in each of the Persons, and therefore descended to earth in the Son. Nor into the specific relation of the Son in the Godhead, the Eternal Logos or Word, to the manifestation of God in the creature and in man. These questions lead into a province of speculative theology which is neither encouraged, nor guided, nor rewarded, by any sacred oracle. It is our wisdom to confine ourselves to what is revealed

II. It has already been proved that the Eternal Son, as such, was sent by the Father, in the Divine counsel and act of the Trinity; that He came therefore spontaneously, to save mankind. It is necessary now only to show that the one eternal personality is continued in the new manifestation of God among men

1. We naturally turn to the account of the incarnation itself for the evidence of this. But, in receiving this evidence, we must remember that the subsequent Scripture, especially the prologue of St. John, sheds its light upon that narrative. Men here interpret the voice of angels. The Only-begotten of the Father 1 was the Word Who was made flesh; 2 God gave His Son, Only-begotten, by sending Him into the world; and of that Son, Onlybegotten, it was said in the great annunciation: That Holy Thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. 3 This Son of the Highest, 4 therefore, did not become the Son of God in the incarnation; He brought His sonship into our nature with Him. No argument can evade this conclusion. It may be said that in many passages which are sometimes pleaded in behalf of the Eternal Sonship the term Son refers to the historical and manifested Christ: for instance, Our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ. 5 But when we read that God sent His Only-begotten Son into the world, and immediately afterwards the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world, 6 the simple and obvious meaning ought not to be mistaken. The Father Who is God, and God Who is the Father, sendeth. God does not become the Father by sending the Son 1 John 3:16; 2 John 1:14; 3 Luke 1:35; 4 Luke 1:32; 5 1 John 1:3; 6 1 John 4:9-14

2. This gives the law for the interpretation of the names, derived from that sonship, which the Lord Himself and His servants habitually use. Whatever titles He adopts or receives in relation to His office, the term Son always enters into the designation of His Person His pre-eminent name is throughout the New Testament the Son of God, or the Son absolutely. If He calls Himself the Son of Man, we can hardly disjoin the Eternal Sonship even from that title. For the Son of man literally He never was: His true paternity and filiation were Divine: and as the Son, even in the fashion of man, He was still the Son of God in humanity. Hence, omitting the predicatives OF GOD and OF MAN, the simple name THE SON preserves to Him His eternal and everlasting character as the Second Person of the Trinity made manifest in the flesh. A Person in the Godhead continues His personality in the human nature, which is therefore of necessity itself impersonal or without any personal existence independent of the Divine. That Person is not the Father, nor the Holy Spirit, but the Son. Accordingly it will be found that in the greater number of passages in which the term

Son, absolutely, is used, the reference is to the Incarnate Person, Who is not only the Son of God and the Son of Man, but the Son uniting the two

III. The importance of remembering that the Divine personality of the Son runs on, the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever, is very great, and may be illustrated in many ways

1. It gives unity to the Person and unity to the work of the Redeemer. It preserves the Divinity of both. While it leaves to the human nature its perfection, it denies to it a distinct personal existence. The manhood was taken up into the Godhead, not the Godhead received by a human person. The Lord is not united in fellowship with a human subject. He does not hold communion with His lower nature as distinct from His Divine Self. It is true that in the humiliation of His impoverishment for us He speaks and acts from a human consciousness. But the condescension was voluntary; and all that belongs to it He makes His own Divine act. Though He was a Son, yet learned He obedience: 1 this statement has no such emphasis in it as the writer designed, if the voluntary condescension of a Son equal with the Father is not in it. Thus this truth, on the one hand, saves the Person of Christ from the unimaginable surrender of anything that belonged to Him as the Son of God, while, on the other, it prevents our assigning the humiliation of Christ to a human nature the sufferings and acts of which the Son made His own only by imputation. He learned all that His passion taught as in the flesh, but He learned it as the Son. Hence the simplicity with which the mission of the Son from heaven to earth is always alluded to. Sometimes reference is made to the nature He assumed in order to accomplish His work; but sometimes, indeed still oftener, the purpose of the Son's commission is represented as if accomplished by that Son alone. God sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins: 2 the nature that gave Him His sacrifice is not mentioned. In fact, the Scripture assumes that the SUPPOSITUM INTELLIGENS, the self-determining and responsible Agent, the Person who saved us, is the Son of God 1 Hebrews 5:8; 2 1 John 4:10

2. And it shows us the bond between the Divine Sonship and our own. The perfect design of Christianity, and that which is so to speak its peculiarity, is to bring God near to man as a Father: to restore His Fatherly relation to mankind. And the soul of personal Christianity is the adoption which makes us as regenerate the sons of God. Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father.1 By the virtue of His Divinity the Savior redeemed us with His precious blood; by the power of the Holy Ghost He sanctifies us from all sin to Himself; but the new life with its privileges to which He introduces us in His Gospel is the virtue of His Divine Sonship in us: His eternal filial life poured afresh into our human nature

1 Galatians 4:6 THE PERFECT MANHOOD The human nature that our Lord assumed, the human conditions under which He appeared, included all that properly belongs to man. The integrity of His manhood admitted no defect in any of its elements, nor any superfluity; He was man, but in the sinless development of pure humanity. Human nature in Him was perfectly realized; and He subjected Himself to all the conditions of human life

I. The Manhood of Christ is declared in Scripture to be perfect in the sense of possessing all that belongs to human nature. He is the Man Christ Jesus, 1 or Jesus Christ, Man: the strongest and clearest declaration on this subject in the New Testament. He is the Son of Man; He was partaker of flesh and blood; 2 and came in the flesh; being made of a woman; 3 in the likeness of men; and in the likeness of sinful flesh: Man, but in the likeness of men; Flesh, but in the likeness of sinful flesh 1 1 Timothy 2:5; 2 Galatians 4:4; 3 Romans 8:3

1. More particularly, His human nature had each of the constituent elements of that nature. Our Lord was conceived of the Virgin, nourished of her substance during gestation, and born as other men. His body was real: even after the resurrection He said, A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have. 1 He possessed a human spirit, the seat of intellect, sensibility, and will. Of intellect, limited of necessity: Jesus increased inWis 2:1-24 and of some things was ignorant; of sensibility: His soul was exceeding sorrowful, 3 and He was meek and lowly in heart; 4 of will: not as I will, but as Thou wilt.5 And, so far as a threefold distinction may be admitted in human nature, He was, essentially and of necessity, what we become through His Spirit, sanctified wholly and kept blameless throughout body, soul, and spirit. Reason was in Him the limited reflection of His own eternal Logos; His spirit was the abode of the Eternal Spirit restored in Him to our race; and through His soul He allied Himself with the needs and infirmities of sensuous human nature. He appropriated all its elements in their unity that He might redeem all 1 Luke 24:39; 2 Luke 2:52; 3 Matthew 26:38; 4 Matthew 11:29; 5 Matthew 26:39

2. From this it follows that as Man our Lord added nothing to His Manhood by assuming it into the Godhead. The Divine Logos neither displaced the human spirit, nor raised it to a condition transcending human limits. Upon this truth rests, as we shall see, the possibility of the Saviour's language of subordination

II. The human nature of our Lord underwent a sinless process: a development in common with other men, but, unlike that of other men, without sin. That is to say, on the one hand, the union with Divinity did not arrest the natural evolution of the humanity; and, on the other, that union did avail to secure the perfect development of the lower nature, under the conditions, however, of making its infirmities the instrument and medium of the atoning Obedience and Passion. These topics will be touched upon under the Mediatorial History: at present it is required to state them only so far as they are essential to a right view of the Perfect Manhood of Christ

1. Our Lord was perfectly Man: teleios His human nature was the perfect realization of the eternal idea of mankind. Hence He calls Himself the SON OF MAN; and by St. Paul is termed the Second and better, or Last Adam:1 ho eschatos Adam. While immortality in Adam was a gift conditional, in Christ it was absolute: in Him was life. 2 But He was sent to exhibit the perfection of a human existence in the world of sin, and therefore the course of His life underwent the common development. Reserving the mystery of His introduction into our race, He was ever after in all points as one of us 1 1 Corinthians 15:45; 2 John 1:4

2. But He came in the likeness of sinful flesh: 1 in the flesh of infirmity and capability of suffering and death. He surrendered His right to the immortality of His holy Manhood, and of Himself laid down His life. But there is another meaning of the Flesh in Scripture which has nothing in Christ: that of the seventh chapter of the Romans, In Him was the mystery of all the consequences of sin as the endurance of sorrow without the sin itself that causes sorrow. The development of His human nature was absolutely sinless: because it was that Holy Thing 2 which belonged to and was called and is the Son of God, 1 Romans 8:3; 2 Luke 1:35 THE DIVINE-HUMAN PERSON The Divine-human Person is the union, the result of the union, of the two natures; or rather the personality that unites the conditions of Divine and human existence. This personality is one and undivided; as is testified by the phraseology which assigns both to the Person and the work of Christ attributes taken from either nature, while the Subject of all predicates is one. The two

natures of the one Person are not confounded or fused together; this is guaranteed to reason by the eternal necessity of the case, as also by the fact that none of the attributes of either of the two natures is ever in Scripture assigned to the other This union of the two natures in one person receives no name in the New Testament

Theology designates it the HYPOSTATICAL UNION. This term is derived from the later use of Hypostasis to represent the Personal subsistences in the Godhead in contradistinction from their common Substance or Essence. Hence it signifies that only one Hypostasis or Person is the resultant of the union of the two natures. It defines no more than that. And it is therefore only the theological expression of the truth concerning Christ which, without a definition, pervades the Scripture. But there are two errors against which it must be guarded, or rather against which the two words of the term guard the doctrine respectively. As the union is HYPOSTATICAL, it is not the conjunction of two natures by any bond that allows them to be conceived of as separate. As the Hypostasis results from a UNION, there can be no blending of the two natures into a composite which should be no longer either, but something between God and man

I. The undivided and indivisible unity of the ONE CHRIST stamps the phraseology of Scripture, in its references both to His Person and to His work. Let us consider each in its order

1. Whether He speaks of Himself or His Apostles speak of Him, it is the rule that, whatever name may be given to our Lord as the subject, predicates are applied to it taken from both natures or interchangeably from either of them. A few illustrations will be sufficient; but these must be carefully classified, as the induction by which we gain our general principle or formula

(1.) In all those passages, already referred to, which unite in one sentence the Divine and the human, the subject is Jesus Christ, and the predicates are taken from both natures. The church of God, which he hath purchased with His own blood: 1 He, the subject, has for predicates God and the Manhood the blood of which was shed. So also when it is said that they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory. 2 In fact, all the passages that have been quoted as illustrating the general proposition, and others that might be added, contain virtually attributives from both natures 1 Acts 20:28; 2 1 Corinthians 2:8

(2.) In some, however, the one subject has specially a Divine predicate. The Son of Man, the subject, has for its predicate which is in heaven.1 The glory which I had with Thee2 comes under the same law; and many others, such as before Abraham was, IAmos 3:1-15 1 John 3:13; 2 John 17:5; 3 John 8:58

(3.) In other passages—in the nature of the case the abundant majority—the predicate is simply and purely human. Jesus was asleep,1 Jesus wept, 2 His soul was exceeding sorrowful, and He said after the resurrection Touch Me not.3 These enter of course into the very substance of the history of His humbled estate; and the last and most mysterious illustration is the double cry with which the Savior finished expiation: My God, My God, Why hast Thou forsaken Me? 4 and Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit!5 1 Mark 4:38; 2 John 11:35; 3 John 20:17; 4 Matthew 27:46; 5 Luke 23:46

(4.) If we carry this law with us into the New Testament we shall find that One Person everywhere appears, who speaks and is spoken of sometimes as God, sometimes as man, sometimes as both; and without the slightest care to obviate possible misapprehension The One Christ, with His

two classes of attributes, is always taken for granted as familiar to Christian consciousness

2. This unity appears also in all that is said of the Redeemer's work. His entire mediatorial agency is not that of the Son of God only, not that of the Son of Man, but that of the Theanthropos, the GOD-MAN in His whole Person, undivided and indivisible

(1.) It is to be observed that, negatively, Scripture never draws a line of demarcation between Divine acts and human in the mission and functions of Jesus. It does distinguish, as we have seen, between the natures, and that in a very elaborate way, which makes the absence of the other distinction more marked

(2.) Every possible variety of names is given to the One Agent in redemption; and every aspect and act of His work is ascribed to each appellative: the Word, the Son, Jesus, Christ, Jesus Christ, all represent Him who took flesh and became man, redeemed the world, rules in the present dispensation, and will lay down His mediatorial authority when the end shall have come

(3.) Sometimes language is used which allies the humanity with the Divinity in the preexisting state. The Incarnate Lord seems to be in heaven before the ascension, before the incarnation, before the world was: He, the Second Man, is [the Lord] from heaven; 1 and the condescension of Christ Jesus, as the example on earth of self-sacrifice, St. Paul carries up to the eternity of His existence in the form of God. 2 In Him, the Incarnate Head of the mystical church, the saints are regarded as predestinated unto the adoption 3 in an eternal purpose. So the Lamb was slain, and redemption wrought, before the foundation of the world. 4 Sometimes, on the other hand, terms are employed which might seem to bring the eternal existence of the Author of redemption into time, as when the Son is said to be fully begotten this day in our nature: This day have I begotten Thee.5 1 1 Corinthians 15:47; 2 Php 2:6; 3 Ephesians 1:5; 4 1 Peter 1:20; 5 Acts 13:33

(4.) But always and everywhere the Agent is one: one in personality, one in the operation or energeia thandriko. All that was done and suffered was done and suffered by the one Redeemer: the Son of God, the Son of man, the Son, Jesus Christ Man, the One Mediator

He is one: by a bond between His natures that has no similitude or analogy in the compass of human thought, save that of the union between the soul and body of man And here lies the foundation of the whole superstructure of the redeeming work: all is Divine in its infinite virtue and efficacy, all is human in its validity for mankind. The One Christ who redeemed the world may be distinguished as to His natures; but in His work the distinction vanishes again

II. While the Person is one in the unity of Divinity and manhood, the Scriptures never confound the two natures themselves. This appears first in the fact that positively the two elements are placed in antithesis to each other; and, secondly, that negatively none of the attributes of one nature is ever applied to the other

1. For the former we may refer again to the passages already cited as proving the distinction of the natures, of which St. Paul has given, so to speak, the formula: Who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh; and declared to be the Son of God with power according to the Spirit of holiness. 1 The antithesis is to be assumed in all those texts which speak of the Son or the Word becoming flesh or becoming man. This applies to St. John especially, in whose language was made or became is equivalent to come into: The Word became flesh2 is equivalent to Jesus Christ

is come in the flesh.3 Flesh and Spirit are not more absolutely distinct in the unmaterialistic teaching of the Bible, and in the philosophy of common sense, than the two natures of the Redeemer 1 Romans 1:3-4; 2 John 1:14; 3 1 John 4:3

2. Negatively, appeal may be made to the careful decorum of Scripture, which never predicates of the Deity of Christ in the abstract the attributes of humanity, nor of Christ's Manhood in itself the attributes of the Godhead. When it is said: to feed the church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood, 1 God, or the Lord, as the reading may be, is the Person of Christ whose human blood and not His Divinity as such purchased the church. This phraseological rule has no exception

1 Acts 20:28

3. There needs, however, no proof of either of these positions. In the nature of things the Infinite cannot become the finite, save in the irrational speculations of Pantheism. The Divine nature and the human are essentially and eternally distinct. It may be said that there is communion between us and God, and union between man and God in Christ. But in the God-man Himself this union is communion too: communion of the natures in the union of the Person SCRIPTURAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE The passages which have been cited in confirmation of the several propositions concerning the Person of Christ render needless any lengthened examination of the Scriptural testimony. But it will be useful to take a general view of the several forms of the doctrine as gradually revealed by the Holy Ghost: of the course of development by which the MYSTERY OF GOD, CHRIST, 1 was gradually made known to the apprehension of faith while still re-served as a mystery not to be comprehended of reason. The bare outline of the subject is all that will be given: first of the Old-Testament preparatory teaching; then of the Saviour's testimony to Himself; and, lastly, of the mature Apostolical teaching after Pentecost. It must be remembered that we have only to do with the indivisible unity of the Saviour's Person in the two natures 1 Colossians 2:2

I. Our Lord on two occasions emphatically declared that the Old Testament testified concerning Himself. First, when He gave this solitary commandment to search the Scriptures, 1 this was the enforcement and reward of the injunction. After the resurrection He Himself searched the Scriptures 2 with two of His disciples as they were never searched by any other; and gave them in that unpreserved discourse the outline we have to fill up. We find in the ancient records intimations of the human nature and the Divine running parallel but distinct at first; and in the later Old Testament these are united in the predictions of one Incarnate Person Who, as Servant of Jehovah, unites the two 1 John 5:39; 2 Luke 24:27

1. He is THE SEED: a term which pervades the Bible as signifying the element of man's nature in its development, the symbol of its continuity as a race; and, as applied to Christ, has a specific relation to His position in mankind as its representative. First, He is the Seed of the woman: 1 this First Gospel contains a promise of a Divine Conqueror of Satan, but it declares only as yet the representative manhood of Christ. Secondly, He is the Seed of Abraham: in thy Seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed. 2 Thirdly, He is the Seed of David: I will set up thy Seed after thee . . . and I will stablish the throne of His kingdom for ever. 3 These several predictions are severally interpreted in the New Testament of the One Christ, Who was the Son sent forth made of a woman, 4 concerning Whom it had been said by St. Paul just before that the promise to Abraham

referred to ONE, And to thy Seed, Which is Christ, 5 Who is the Seed of David according to the flesh, but the Son of God with power. 6 They are three converging prophecies which recur in the Psalms and in the Prophets in various forms 1 Genesis 3:15; 2 Genesis 22:18; 3 2 Samuel 7:12-13; 4 Galatians 4:4; 5 Galatians 3:16; 6 Romans 1:3

2. Concurrently and running parallel with these He is the ANGEL or JEHOVAH Who appeared to Abraham and promised to him the coming of Himself the Seed. My Name is in Him. 1 He is the ANGEL OF THE FACE OF JEHOVAH; 2 and the prophet Hosea recalling His wrestling with the patriarch terms Him Jehovah God of Hosts. 3 He is the Angel of the Covenant 4 in Malachi; and this name looks back upon the earlier Theophany or manifestation of the revealing Song of Solomon 5:1-16 in angel form, and looks forward to His future appearance in His own elect form of Man. Accordingly in the New Testament He is the Jehovah Who, as Incarnate, came to His literal temple, and Whose voice Isaiah had heard in the temple mystical, when he saw His glory and spake of Him.6 1 Exodus 23:21; 2 Isaiah 63:9; 3 Hosea 12:5; 4 Malachi 3:1; 5 Isaiah 6:1; 6 John 12:41 3. The two natures are also united in the later Old Testament

(1.) Three Psalms may be selected as pre-eminently conclusive: not as exhausting the subject, but as the key indicated by the New Testament for the solution of the ancient mystery of Christ. 1 Thou art My Son; this day have I begotten Thee: 2 the former part of this sentence is declared in St. John to refer to an eternal Son-ship; 3 the latter by St. Paul to refer to His revelation in the flesh perfected and demonstrated in the resurrection.4 The LORD said unto my Lord: 5 here Jehovah at the beginning and Adonai at the end both belong to the Supreme; and the Lord of David is in His Incarnate Person exalted to the right hand of God. Thy throne, 0 God, is for ever and ever 6 . . . God, Thy God, hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows. The name of God is here given to the Eternal Son, Whose human excellence, in union with the Godhead, finishes the incarnate character and stamps the incarnate supremacy of Him concerning Whom it is said to the, Church: He is thy Lord; and worship thou Him.7 1 Ephesians 3:4; 2 Psalms 2:7; 3 John 1:14; 4 Acts 13:33; 5 Psalms 110:1; 6 Psalms 14:6-7; 7 Psa. 14:11

(2.) The testimony of Jesus through the Spirit of prophecy is still more distinct in the prophets proper. The Jehovah of Isaiah's vision is that Christ Who is the Child born and the Son given: 1 as the latter THE MIGHTY GOD; as the former, or rather in His incarnate Person, Wonderful, the Prince of Peace, 2 a wonder to the adoring contemplation of faith, the peace of its satisfied possession. Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and shall call His name IMMANUEL: in this name, which our Savior never bore as a personal designation, the full mystery of the Christ of God is announced. Micah speaks of the Ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting . . .. And this MAN shall be the peace. 3 Jeremiah prophesies of the Redeemer, And this is His name whereby He shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS: 4 raised up to David as the Incarnate Righteousness He is JEHOVAH; 5 and gives His name to the Holy City, the Church, as inheriting the righteousness of God in Him. The Divine testimony to the Man that is My Fellow, saith the Lord of Hosts, in Zechariah, is plain in its profound meaning when connected with they shall look upon ME whom they have pierced, 6 and with the New-Testament quotations both of the Redeemer and St. John. Daniel first gives Jehovah incarnate the title Son ofMan 1:7 and exhibits Him as invested with supreme dominion: One like the Son ofMan 1:8 must be paralleled with The form of the fourth is like the Son of God. 9 Our Saviour's application of Daniel's titles will vindicate for him perhaps the highest place among the

ancient testimonies. Malachi closes them in the Canon with the prophecy of that Angel of the covenant 10 who in the fulfillment is Christ coming to His temple: this may be regarded as the last and crowning demonstration that the Jehovah of the Old Testament is the LORD of the New

1 Isaiah 9:11; 2 Isaiah 7:14; 3 Micah 5:2; Micah 5:5; 4 Jeremiah 23:6; 5 2 Corinthians 5:12; 6 Zechariah 12:10; 7 Matthew 24:30; 8 Revelation 1:7; 9 Daniel 7:13; 10 Malachi 3:1

(3.) It must be added that the Incarnate Person thus foreshadowed, and more than foreshadowed, in the earlier Scriptures is both in psalm and prophecy exhibited as the subordinate Agent of the work of the Mediatorial Trinity. Reserving the fuller treatment of this for its own place, we need only to indicate that the future Christ is the Lord's Anointed, 1 or Messiah; the Minister of God: Behold My Servant, Whom I uphold. 2 The Word of the Lord 3 in Samuel's days is the eternal Wisdom, God Himself and yet distinct: personified in the Proverbs 4:1-27 He is incarnate by that name in the New Testament; but in both the revealer of the Divine counsel. These latter terms, however, like that of the Angel, are not specifically connected in the Old Testament with the human nature of our Lord. They belong rather to His unrevealed Divine-human Person: the ANGEL-SERVANT or the SERVANT-SON of Jehovah 1 Psalms 2:2; 2 Isaiah 42:1; 3 1 Samuel 3:21; 4 Proverbs 8:30-31

(4.) The Old-Testament testimony, read in the light of the New, is thus most abundant and most clear. But the incarnation of the Son of God was a mystery until He came. Later Jewish theology does not indicate that it was anticipated by the nation. And St. Paul tells us that Christ was the mystery of God, 1 even as the revelation of salvation to the world was, until the fullness of the time.2 1 Colossians 2:2; 2 Galatians 4:4

II. Our Lord's witness to His One indivisible Divine-human Person is in the nature of things supreme: it explains the pre-intimations of the Old Testament, and it gives all the elements which, under the teaching of the Holy Ghost, were more or less developed by Evangelists and Apostles. It is to be sought simply and only in His own sayings upon earth and from heaven

1. The testimony given by Jesus concerning this mystery while on earth has been anticipated in the earlier treatment of the One Personality. It may be stated more fully, though in epitome, and with necessary repetition, as follows: — (1.) He adopts for Himself three names, THE SON OF GOD, THE SON OF MAN, and THE SON The first, employed but seldom, refers to His Divine nature; the second, habitually used, makes Him one with mankind; and the third is very generally if not always applied to His indivisible Person as including the two former

(2.) While this is generally true, it is true also that each of these three names is referred by the Redeemer to His One Person as pre-existing in an equality with the Father; as Man among men; and as one and the same in time and in eternity, in heaven and upon earth His use of them may be studied with advantage 2. This may be illustrated by a few passages which give our Lord's self-revelation as found in the Evangelists

(1.) The term Son of God He seldom Himself used; but He accepted the title, in its Divine significance, from His disciples and from His enemies. The latter understood Him to make Himself equal with God; 1 and this our Lord confirmed, both then and on many other occasions: That all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. 2 I and My Father are One. He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father. 3 He was accused of blasphemy for calling Himself the Son of God. He had not given Himself the name; but He accepted it and appealed to His works for

evidence that it was His right: the Father is in Me and I in Him. 4 But, as the Son of the living God He is also the Son of Man; and, when Simon Peter uttered that confession, 5 His Master declared the knowledge of His Divine-human Person to have been given by the revelation of the Father Himself. Only once does the Lord as it were spontaneously term Himself the Son of God; and then He offers Himself to the healed blind man in the Temple as a human speaker: Dost thou believe on the Son of God? . . It is He that talketh with thee. 6 This is a very remarkable instance 1 John 5:18-21; 2 John 10:30; 3 John 14:9; 4 John 10:38; 5 Matthew 16:16-17; 6 John 9:35; John 9:37

(2.) Generally He speaks as The Son absolutely: always with reference to the Father, but always in His incarnate relation. It is needless to quote any other passages than those in which the One Lord, the Son, declares His pre-existence and equality with God. As the Son He said: Before Abraham was IAmos 1:1-15 declaring both His pre-existence and His eternity. So also when He claimed to have from the Father life in Himself: 2 life originated in the Father, but eternal or without beginning. Neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son: 3 the Son in His incarnate person as Man alone revealeth the Father. And it is the Son approaching the cross as man who prays: glorify Thou Me with Thine own Self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was.4 1 John 8:58; 2 John 5:26; 3 Matthew 11:27; 4 John 17:5

(3.) But, as the name Son of Man was that which the Redeemer elected for Himself, so it is that which brings into fullest expression the unity of the Incarnate Person. He assumed it instead of the more limited Messiah or Christ: as being the Messianic designation that allied Him with all mankind. And it is the subject of an endless variety of predicates taken from His two natures interchangeably. This has been already sufficiently shown. It may suffice to appeal once more to His first use of the Name He loved so well. And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven. 1 Here are the pre-existence, the descent, and the return of Him Who in His one person is the Son of Man. Another saying recorded by St. John as spoken at the end of the Saviour's ministry transfers this to the Son absolutely: I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.2 The entire doctrine of our Lord's Divine and Divine-human Sonship is here 1 John 3:13; 2 John 16:28

3. The testimony given from heaven is the supplement of that in the Gospels; and it removes any slight vestige of doubt which some of the sayings uttered in His subordination may have left. Of it we may use the Apostles' words: now speakest Thou plainly. 1 The final Apocalypse, or Revelation concerning Jesus Christ, was given by Jesus to St. John, and through him to the Church for ever. The Redeemer Himself appears in His final and most glorious manifestation in His human form, as One like a Son of man; 2 but says as God, Fear not, I am the First and the Last. And, after many words which show that He is still the exalted Servant of the Trinity, He leaves lingering in our ears the last of all His testimonies: It is done.... I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last. 3 Thus the supreme witness is His own 1 John 16:29; 2 Revelation 1:11 3 Revelation 22:13

III. The testimony of the Evangelists and Apostles is that of the Savior Himself through the Spirit: it is the fulfillment of the promise, He shall glorify Me.1

1 John 16:14

1. The Evangelists take precedence. But, as St. John's must be regarded as Apostolic testimony, there remains only that of the Synoptists. St. Matthew and St. Luke give them in the Genealogies. In the former, the Seed of David is Immanuel, God with us; 1 in the latter, the Seed of the Woman is the Son of God;2 the former connects Him with Joseph, His reputed father, with Judaism and the Old Testament, the latter with Mary, with the World and the New Dispensation. The Synoptists and St. John perfectly agree; though St John, as will be seen, makes more direct reference to the Divine nature of the Incarnate 1 Matthew 1:23; 2 Luke 1:35

2. It is common to the Apostles to call their Master LORD, a title which bases the mediatorial supremacy of the Redeemer upon the fundamental dignity of Jehovah the LORD; and it is common to them also to assign to Him attributes and to demand for Him homage which imply His Divinity. The distinct types of their teaching as to the One Person may be briefly indicated

(1.) St. Peter, preaching in the Acts to strangers gathered into Jerusalem, proclaims the Messianic authority of Christ in general, and does not as yet dwell on the mystery of the Divine-human origin of the Man approved of God. 1 He accumulates names which imply Divine dignity, such as the Holy One and the Just, the Prince of life; 2 but the subordination of the Servant of God of Whom Isaiah spoke is uppermost: God, having raised up His Son, paida, 3 not the Son absolutely, but the Servant-Son. In his Epistles he continues the tribute to the mediatorial Messiah, and opens with a benediction of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. 4 Afterwards he speaks of Christ as put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; 5 here bringing the two natures into conjunction by the same formula which St. Paul uses. In the Second Epistle we read of the righteousness of God and our Savior Jesus Christ; 6 believers are said to partake of His Divine nature; and with the Lord a thousand years a/re as one day. 7 Moreover St. Peter closes his ministry with a Doxology, which only God can receive: Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. To Him be glory both now and for ever. Amen. 8 St. James calls the Savior the Lord of Glory: 9 that worthy Name which belongs to Deity alone. And St. Jude ascribes to the only wise God our Savior glory and majesty.10

1 Acts 2:22; 2 Acts 3:14-15; 3 Acts 3:26; 4 1 Peter 1:3; 5 1 Peter 3:18; 6 2 Peter 1:1-4; 2 Peter 3:8; 7 2 Peter 3:18; 8 2 Peter 3:18; 9 James 2:1; James 2:7; 10 Jude 1:25

(2.) St. Paul has an order of testimonies peculiar to himself. Most of them, however, have been already quoted; and those which belong to the subordination of the Person of Christ must be reserved. The Epistle to the Romans is pre-eminently the Mediatorial treatise, and contains the clearest expression of the unity and distinction in the two natures. In the beginning it is thus stated: The Seed of David according to the flesh, 1 or the human nature, and declared or defined to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, or the Divine. Here is a twofold sonship and a twofold nature. The same distinction is varied afterwards: Of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, Who is over all, God blessed for ever. 2 There cannot be a doubt that it is the express design of the Apostle to unite the two natures here. Between these there is another of great importance. God sent His own Son, the Son of Himself, in the likeness of sinful flesh; 3 that own Son whom He spared not, where the idiou Huiou corresponds to the Patera idion of the Jews' correct inference: He called God His own Father. 4 In the Corinthian Epistle, remarkable for the fullest expression of the mediatorial subordination, there are some plain announcements of the Divine-human dignity. Christ is the Lord of glory5 Whom as to His human nature the princes of this

world crucified. And where His subordination is most expressly taught He is the Lord from heaven and a quickening Spirit 6 in His Divine nature, while the second Adam in His human. The Lord is that Spirit, 7 Who is God; and it is at the close of these Epistles, in which the head of ChristisGod, 8 that the Trinitarian benediction is pronounced, placing the Incarnate in the Trinity as the channel of all the grace that flows from the love of God, and is made the common possession of believers through the Holy Spirit. The Epistles of the Roman Captivity — the three Christological Epistles proper — contain another type of expression: in harmony with that of St. Paul's previous and subsequent writings but very different. In that to the Colossians the Person of Christ, the Son of the Father's love, is the Image of the invisible God, the Firstborn of (or before} every creature; 9 and in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. 10 Now these wonderful words describe the Incarnate Person; not rising however from the lower nature, as in the Romans, but descending from the higher. It is said of Him Whose blood redeemed men that HE is the Image of God: Himself invisible as Spirit but manifesting the Godhead in the flesh; that HE IS the Firstbegotten before every creature—for in Him were all things created, and He is before all things, —but also the Firstborn of the created human race as the heir and representative of all: Firstborn in two senses. The Ephesian Epistle contains no express statement on this topic. But, as the special document of the Mediatorial Trinity, it assigns to our Lord a place in relation to God and to the Church and to the individual soul which belongs to no creature. It is observable that here alone St. Paul joins St. Peter in blessing the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, 11 words that might seem to refer the former appellation to the humanity and the latter to the Divinity of Christ, but really belong to the doctrine of His subordination. The Epistle to the Philippians is peculiar as giving the only passage in which St. Paul approaches the mystery of the incarnation. Christ Jesus 12 is the one subject of every predicate in that paragraph where the whole career of the Redeemer is condensed into one sublime example of condescension. As to His Divinity He was, or rather is, in the form of God: hupárchoon establishes the consubstantial Deity, and morpho Theou the personal subsistence in the Trinity. As to His manhood, He is in fashion as a man; rather, as Man in the likeness of men. The word made connects the passage with those words to the Galatians, made of a woman, 13 and more remarkably with St. John's, The Word was made flesh; 14 while St. Paul's likeness of men shows us that St. John's expression must not be misinterpreted into declaring a real change from one nature into another. The form of a servant expresses the unity of the mediatorial subordinate Person. The Pastoral Epistles contain the Apostle's final testimony: his FAITHFUL SAYINGS. One or two new forms of the doctrine appear. The glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior: 15 these words are not absolutely unparalleled in St Paul; they are the final echo of that early God over all, blessed for ever. 16 The words God and Savior grammatically belong to one person, just as the God and Father of Christ is one in the Philippian Epistle. Theologically, they belong to the one Person Who is God, and, as Incarnate, our Savior. It must not be forgotten that God our Savior 17 has been before made synonymous with Jesus Christ our Savior. In the First Epistle to Timothy there is a new example of the method of conjoining the two natures: the Mystery of godliness Who was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit. 18 And this throws its light back on those words: for there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus, 19 or Christ Jesus, MAN. The two passages mutually explain each other In the last of these Pastorals the Apostle takes his farewell of the subject in the doxology in which he invites the universal Church to say Amen: And the Lord shall deliver me. 20 TO WHOM BE GLORY FOR EVER AND EVER. AMEN

1 Romans 1:3; 2 Romans 9:5; 3 Romans 8:3; Romans 8:32; 4 John 5:18; 5 1 Corinthians 2:8; 6 1 Corinthians 15:45-47; 7 2 Corinthians 3:17; 8 1 Corinthians 11:3; 9 Colossians 1:15-17; 10 Colossians 2:9; 11 Ephesians 1:3; 12 Php 2:6; Php 2:8; 13 Galatians 4:4; 14 John 1:14; 15 Titus 2:13; 16 Romans 9:5; 17 Titus 1:3-4; 18 1 Timothy 3:16; 19 1 Timothy 2:5; 20 2 Timothy 4:18

(3.) The Epistle to the Hebrews adds nothing positively new to the form of the doctrine; but it is abundantly clear in the doctrine itself. The first chapter is simply an exhibition of the Divinity of the Incarnate as such. It begins with another reading of St. Paul's teaching to the Colossians: the Son incarnate—for God hath spoken in HisSong of Solomon 1:1-17— is the effulgence of His glory, and the express image of His person. 2 He is called God by the Father, Who seats Him on His mediatorial throne; and to Him is ascribed the production of all phenomena, which He creates and lays aside, being Himself THE SAME. 3 The second chapter exhausts the verity of our Lord's manhood. Both He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one. 4 He took part of the same; the children's flesh and blood. 5 After the two chapters have dwelt on the two natures severally, we are called upon in the third—the mystery of the junction of the two natures being behind the veil— to consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, [Christ] Jesus. 6 This Person, from God to man Apostle and from man to God High Priest, through the eternal Spirit offered HIMSELF: 7 that is, as Divine, His eternal Spirit offered His humanity as a sacrifice. And the Apostle at the close revolves back into the thought which closed the first chapter, in words which condense the whole doctrine of the Indivisible Person: Jesus Christ, the Same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.8

1 Hebrews 1:2 2 Hebrews 1:8; 3 Hebrews 1:10; 4 Hebrews 2:11; 5 Hebrews 2:14; 6 Hebrews 3:1; 7 Hebrews 9:14; 8 Hebrews 13:8

(4.) St. John's personal testimony—apart from his record of our Lord's—is found in the Prologue and Appendix of his Gospel, in his Epistles, and in the Apocalypse. The Prologue assigns to the Divine nature of the Redeemer three names: the Logos, the Son, the God Only-begotten. 1 The human nature is called Flesh. And the union is described as the being made, or becoming, flesh; and as the dwelling in that flesh as a tabernacle: He dwelt among us. The Logos is a term which signifies what Wisdom signified in the Old Testament; it had become current in Jewish theology, and had been perverted; St. John vindicates it, and then uses it no more. The Son is the revelation of the Only-begotten God in the flesh. He became flesh; but not by any transformation, for He only dwelt among us: here the future Eutychian error is obviated. He dwelt among us} but not as a Stranger, for He became flesh, and is glorified in the flesh: here the future Nestorianism is condemned. The high words of the introduction to the Gospel must interpret the whole

After the Prologue St. John rarely speaks; but when he does it is nearly always to exhibit the Divine glory of the Incarnate which, he says, we beheld. 2 Having recorded the first miracle, he adds that Jesus manifested forth His glory. 3 Again he comments on the words of the Lord, He spake of the temple of His body: 4 an evident remembrancer of the tabernacling with us. Similarly the private note on the Lord's symbolical teaching of the mystery of His incarnation: Jesus knowing . . . that He was come from God and went to God. In the First Epistle St. John takes up his Logos term, but combines with it the life: the Word of life. 5 As in his Gospel, he soon passes from that designation, and rests on that of Son. The verity of the union of the two natures is declared by the whole tenor of the opening paragraph: the Life was manifested and we have seen it. He Who in

the Gospel is said to have been made flesh is here said to have come in the flesh. 6 It is remarkable that the Epistle, which begins with the Word of Life that was manifested, ends with the same: This is the true God, and eternal life. 7 And Who is the true God? St John's answer is his last testimony, and perhaps the last testimony of the Bible: we are in Him that is true, in His Son Jesus Christ.8 1 John 1:1-10; 2 John 1:14; 3 John 2:11; 4 John 2:21; 5 John 8:3; 6 1 John 1:1-2; 7 1 John 4:3; 8 1 John 5:20

(5.) But, with regard to St. John as to all the other recorders of the Saviour's history and work, the best argument of their teaching concerning the unity, uniqueness and supremacy of the Divine-human Person is the general tone and character of their common presentation. It is not so much the result of a fair estimate of the meaning of certain passages, nor the induction derived from a comparison of many, as the impression made upon the thoughtful reader, especially if he is a devout reader, by the spirit and manner of their communications. Wherever we enter the presence of Jesus we feel that we are before One Who is God and yet not only God, man and yet not only man. There is scarcely a page or an incident on a page which can be understood on the theory of either nature being alone in Christ: always some residuum requires the other nature. There is nothing similar in all literature; it is a conception that has no parallel. And that all the writers so wonderfully agree in their testimony as to One Person Who is God and man must be ascribed to the fulfillment of His promise. He shall testify of Me.1

1 John 15:26 ECCLESIASTICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE

Generally speaking, it may be said that discussion concerning the Two Natures of Christ has occupied the Christian Church more or less from the beginning; but the controversies that bore upon the One Person as such were limited to the first five centuries. The theories and opinions of those who have denied the Divinity of our Lord do not in strict propriety come into consideration here, since they admit no Person of Christ as our theology understands it. We have to mark, first, the heresies that erred concerning the Two Natures respectively; and, secondly, those which misapprehended the nature of their Union I. The controversy touching the question of the Divinity of Jesus enters here only in an indirect way

1. It took its first form in the Ebionites and Nazarenes, Christians with the old leaven of Judaism not purged out. The EBIONITES derived their name either from Ebion or an adjective signifying poverty, and asserted that Christ was only man; the NAZARENES improved upon this abject view by adding that He was miraculously conceived and endowed. Thus these primitive precursors of HUMANITARIAN doctrine were respectively the representatives of the Socinianism of the sixteenth century and the later Unitarianism of our own age. SOCINIANISM, akin to the Nazarene opinion, allowed that Christ was miraculously born, that He had transcendent fellowship with God in heaven during His life, and that after His resurrection He was exalted above every other creature. It held the inspiration of Scripture, which however it endeavored by a new translation and strange comments to harmonies with its views. By slow degrees this ancient Socinianism lost its distinctive and nobler features, and descended into modern UNITARIANISM, akin to the Ebionite view. Thus the Humanitarian error has completed its circle, ending in these latter days where it began in the post-Apostolic age

2. During the second and third centuries these primitive errors were revived and combined. Theodotus and Artemon in the second century, 180, asserted that Christ was mere man, psilon

anthropon, but supernaturally born of a virgin. Paul of Samosata, in the third century, 261, held the same view; but admitted that the Logos was in Him as a spirit in a higher sense than in the prophets. But the opinions of these heretics were bound up with their erroneous views of the Trinity, and vanished from the Church or were merged in other forms of error

II. Of the early heresies which assailed the natures of our Lord, while all retaining faith in His Person, some erred as to both the Divinity and the humanity, and others as to each of these respectively

1. The Gnostic errors were very various, but they agreed generally in making the Godhead of Christ an emanation and His manhood a semblance only of man. The Divine in Him was an AEon, and the human not a material body, but a psychical or ethereal appearance that had nothing to do with the substance of the Virgin. These heretics were therefore termed Docetae (from dokeo). In the earliest form of Docetism, that of Cerinthus, condemned by St. John, the Man Jesus had a true body on which the Christ descended at his baptism, to abide with him only till his death. Hence the emphasis of the Apostolic statement that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh: 1 not in the mere likeness of flesh

1 1 John 4:2

2. The heresies of Arius and Apollinaris dishonored the two natures respectively: the former denying our Lord's eternal con-substantiality with the Father, the latter denying to Him the human spirit; the former impairing the Godhead, the latter the Manhood. These errors were, however, intimately connected

(1.) Both had their preliminaries in the ante-Nicene age. Origen asserted the eternal generation of the Logos, and gave its due prominence to the doctrine of the Eternal Sonship; but by laying undue stress on the subordination of the Son in the Godhead he paved the way for Arianism. His followers forgot the eternity in his doctrine of the Sonship and his watchword God-man. And when once the Logos in Christ was regarded as a created essence it became in their theory only an earlier and nobler edition of the human spirit, which might well take the place of the reason and intellectual nature of man in man's great Representative

(2.) The doctrine of Christ's Person, as taught by Arius, a presbyter of Alexandria, assigned to the Divine Sonship an origination by the will of God before time and the world existed: the Son hon pote ote ouk hon, and was generated not phusei, but Homoousion. He was the First Creature, though distinguished from the creation as the mediator between God and it. The Nicene Creed (A.D. 325) gives in its defensive clauses the best explanation of the heresy it condemned: BEGOTTEN NOT MADE, OF ONE SUBSTANCE WITH THE FATHER. The term omoousion, OF ONE SUBSTANCE, became the watchword of orthodoxy as represented by Athanasius and the Nicene Council. The Semi-Arians softened this into omoiousion, OF A LIKE SUBSTANCE. The difference, however, between the two terms, though indicated by a single letter, is really unlimited: no creature can be in essence like God. From the Nicene Council downwards there has been no community of Arians, nor any creed of Arianism, in Christendom

(3.) It was soon proved that the Homoousion, "of one substance," was as important for the human nature of Christ as for the Divine. Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicaea (A.D. 362), so defended the Divinity of Christ as to take from Him the integrity of His manhood. The human nature was in God

before the incarnation, and brought with Christ from heaven And the incarnation was only the assumption of the flesh and animal soul of man. The Divine nature rendered the human spirit needless: the Person of Christ was a composite of God and two elements only of human nature. Hence the true God was retained, but not the true nature of man. It was urged against Apollinaris by the great divines of the fourth century that man could not be redeemed without the redemption of his spirit. The Article HE DESCENDED INTO HELL in the Apostles' Creed was in due time inserted for the defense of the separate spirit in Christ; but the condemnation of the doctrine was formally proclaimed at the Second (Ecumenical Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. It is observable that this Council, which asserted the integrity of the human nature of Christ, proclaimed also the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. The Apollinarian errors reappeared, as will be seen, in later forms

III. The heresies which assailed the union of the two natures of our Lord in His one person were two, the Nestorian and the Eutychian: the latter, confounding the Natures, was a recoil from the former, which divided the Person

1. Nestorius was Patriarch of Constantinople (A.D. 428), and a bigoted opponent of heresy. He took offence, however, at one of the current watchwords of orthodoxy, which termed the Virgin the MOTHER OF GOD, THEOTOKOS. He had been trained in the Antiochian school of theology; as a presbyter in Antioch he had imbibed the teaching of Theodore of Mopsuestia—the real founder of Nestorianism—who laid much stress upon the union of the Logos with a man who was born of Mary. Nestorius conceded to his opponents that the Virgin was MOTHER OF CHRIST; but he denied the personal union, taught that a perfect man became the organ and instrument of the Logos, or the temple in which He dwelt. The tendency—perhaps only the tendency—of his teaching was to represent Christ as two persons, united by a bond not essentially different from that which unites God with any other pre-eminent organ of His will. The two natures in the Redeemer were in this theory united by an asugchutos sunapheia: not in one personality, but by a conjunction merely, though of an undefinable nature. Nestorius was formally condemned at the Third (Ecumenical Council, held at Ephesus A.D. 431. His chief opponent was Cyril of Alexandria

2. The followers of Cyril, who died A.D. 444, exaggerated his statements as to " the union in one hypostasis of the Logos from the Father and the human flesh." The mystical Alexandrian school of thought, represented by Eutyches, refused to admit that anything pertaining to Christ was otherwise than Divine after the incarnation. His avowal was this: "I confess that, before the union, our Lord was of two natures (EK DUO PHUSEON); but, after the union, I confess only one nature." The tendency—perhaps here again only the tendency—of this doctrine was not to merge the Divine in the human, nor the human in the Divine, but to establish a composite nature, neither God nor man: one Nature and one Person; not One Person in two Natures. The history of the controversies which led to the assembling of the Fourth (Ecumenical Council, held at Chalcedon A.D. 451, is a painful record of human infirmity overruled by the Spirit of Truth

3. The Formula drawn up at that Council gives in its careful statements the best explanation of the two opposite errors. " Following the holy Fathers, we unanimously teach one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, perfect as to His Godhead and perfect as to His manhood, truly God and truly Man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting: consubstantial with His Father as to His Godhead, and consubstantial with us as to His manhood: like unto us in all things, yet without

sin; as to His Godhead begotten of the Father before all worlds; but, as to His manhood, in these last days born, for us men and our salvation, of the Virgin Mary, the mother of God; one and the same Christ; Son, Lord, Only-begotten, known and acknowledged in two natures, without confusion, without severance, and without division; the distinction of the natures being in no wise abolished by their union, but the peculiarity of each nature being maintained, and the two concurring in one Person and Hypostasis. We confess not a Son divided and sundered into two persons, but one and the same Son, and Only-begotten, and God-Logos, our Lord Jesus Christ, even as the prophets had before proclaimed concerning Him, and He Himself hath taught us, and the symbol of the Fathers hath handed down to us." The four terms in the original Greek deserve careful attention. The two natures are said to be united, asugchutos, without commixture, and atreptos, without transmutation or conversion: these as against Eutyches. The One Person is retained, adiairetos, undividedly, and achoristos, inseparably: these as against Nestorius. Thus was concluded, at the Chalcedonian Council, the long controversy concerning the Person of Christ: "truly" God, " perfectly " Man, "inseparably" One Person, " unconfusedly" in Two Natures. The Athanasian Creed added an analogy: " One not at all from confusion of substance, but from unity of person. For as a rational soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ." Later controversies, and later decisions, were but feebler reproductions of these bold, strong, and incontrovertible statements

IV. The later developments of the Christological dogma have to do rather with the doctrine of our Lord’s Two Estates than with that of His One Person. So far, however, as they affect the latter, they must have brief notice

1. Eutychianism reappeared, or rather continued, in the Monophysite and Monothelite heresies which long disturbed the Eastern Church

(1.) The MONOPHYSITE theory is, as the name imports, that of "One Nature" in Christ. It was held with many subtle distinctions by a number of sects, which concurred in blending the Lord’s Manhood with His Godhead, and differed according to their views of it as a property or as an accident of the Divine nature. These sects have continued to the present day as represented by Jacobites, Copts, Abyssinians, and Armenians

(2.) The MONOTHELITE variation turned upon the question as to the unity or duality of the Redeemer’s will. The Sixth AEcumenical Council, at Constantinople, A.D. 680, condemned the doctrine of One Will in Christ: the Catholic Church, East and West, agreed that in two natures there must be two wills, and that in Christ the Divine and the human wills harmoniously cooperated, the human following the Divine. Much controversy issued in the rejection of the Monothelite heresy, which allowed no place for limitation in knowledge and human temptation or moral test in Christ. With it was rejected also—in ecclesiastical formula at least—the compromise aimed at in the expression mia Theandriko energeia, " one Theandric or Divine-human operation." But, though this term was not accepted generally, it alone expresses the truth of the one mediatorial agency of that Person in Whom the Divine will governed the free volitions of the human. This heresy also has lingered among the Oriental sects to the present time

2. Nestorianism reappeared, long after the Chalcedonian decision, in the West, as Eutychianism reappeared in the East. Two Spanish bishops, Elipandus of Toledo and Felix of Urgella, taught that in His human nature the Redeemer was Son of God only by adoption: an adoption which was

the seal of His excellence, foreseen at the incarnation and consummated at the resurrection. The arguments of Alcuin, and other theologians, based upon the impersonality of our Lord’s human nature—"in adsumtione carnis a Deo persona perit hominis, non natura"—were sufficient to secure the condemnation of this form of Nestorian heresy, which is known as ADOPTIANISM, at the Council of Frankfurt, A.D. 794

3. It may be said that no controversy concerning the Person of Christ has since the Sixth AEcumenical Council disturbed Christendom. The decisions of the Council of Chalcedon, the Fourth AEcumenical, were really decisive. Mediaeval discussions revolved around philosophical and mystical theories of the incarnation, but issued in no new development of dogma and in no very definite new heresy. The discussions in which the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches were engaged, and those which divided the Lutheran divines, touched rather the relation of our Lord’s two natures respectively to His two Estates of humiliation and exaltation; and therefore belong to another section. They were all agreed as combatants, and agreed with the Roman and Greek Churches, in holding the Unity of the Divine-human Person as in some inexplicable way resulting from the assumption of the human by the Divine. They differed only as to the measure in which the attributes of the Deity were hidden or suppressed. It is true that the more modern forms of this controversy involve questions which, seeming to touch only the Humiliation of our Lord, really touch the perfection of one or other or both of His natures. For instance, the theories of many German and French divines which regard the Son of God as literally limiting Himself for a season to the bounds of a human spirit are certainly reproductions of what has been described as Eutychianism. But to this subject we must return when treating of the Two Estates of the Redeemer

19. Vol 02 - The Mediatorial Work in its Process

The Mediatorial Work in its Process THE MEDIATORIAL WORK IN ITS PROCESS: THE INCARNATION Permanent Foundation of the Redeeming Work

Between the Person of Christ and the Finished Work of Redemption we must interpose the process of the Mediatorial Ministry. The New Testament is a history of the Redeemer's mission, delivered partly in facts and partly in commentary on those facts. It sets out with the Incarnation as the basis of the whole; pursues the progress of the Christ through His Two Estates of humiliation and exaltation; describes His assumption of His Mediatorial Work, and His accomplishment of the functions of its three offices of Prophet, Priest, and King. After considering these topics in their order, it will be well to close with a review of our doctrine on the unity of the Person of Christ in all His estates and offices and work, as exhibited in the variety of names assigned to Him in Scripture and theology. This will prepare for the doctrine of the Atonement

There is no method of studying the theology of redemption at once so interesting and so effectual as that which connects it with the successive stages of our Lord's history. This does not, however, demand the presentation of what is commonly called THE LIFE OF JESUS. Modern literature abounds with attempts to depict the Life which is above every life: a career which was spent under conditions that must needs render the attempt abortive. But to these we may apply the ancient apostrophe in another sense: Who shall declare His generation? 1 and the words of the Apostle also that the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. 2 Only the Holy Ghost is or should be the Recorder of that history. And He has given it in its own unapproachable and undefiled perfection as it hath pleased Him. It is true that the effort to exhibit the Holy Character has been made in some works of edification which have preserved the spirit of reverence, aiming to portray the Redeemer as at once a Savior and an example. But often it has been the unbeliever who has undertaken the task; and the replies which he has originated under the same title have sometimes fallen into the errors against which they protest. Yet there is an historical review of the Saviour's career which may be made the basis of the entire system of evangelical theology. The life of our Lord was the manifestation of His Person and of His work, as begun below and continued above; and, remembering that the Acts and the Epistles and the Apocalypse supplement the Gospels, even as the Old Testament is their preface, we shall pursue our study of the Mediatorial Ministry in strict connection with the stages and processes of the Lord's history on earth and in heaven, before and at and after the Fullness of Time 1 Isaiah 53:8; 2 1 Corinthians 2:11 THE INCARNATION The mystery of the Incarnation occupies its own solitary place in theology. It has been seen that in the fullness of time the Eternal Son assumed human nature, conceived by the Holy Ghost; that the mystery is revealed as a fact, and denned by a variety of expressions which leave it a mystery still: no theories availing to explain it. We have now to do with its relation to the entire work of Christ, a relation which is fundamental, and of such a character as to make it the basis of all other acts, and co-ordinate with none: this truth, however, needing to be carefully stated and guarded. The Incarnation, as the foundation of our Lord's redeeming ministry, with all its offices, is everlasting and unchangeable, common therefore to the two estates of

humiliation and exaltation THE INCARNATION A PERMANENT CONDESCENSION

I is the infinite condescension of the Son of God and the glory of man that the union of the two natures in Christ is permanent. He became man once for all: our manhood is a vesture which He will not fold and lay aside. IMMANUEL is His name for ever. This being so, it is scarcely right to speak of our Lord's alliance with our race as part of His mediatorial humiliation: were it such, His humiliation would never terminate. It is true that the effect of His condescension will never cease. He will be one with mankind to all eternity: as it were expressly to declare this, to keep it in the minds of His people and prevent misconception, that one profound saying was placed on record: then shall the Son also Himself be subjected to Him that did subject. 1 His union with us, which is the same thing as His kingdom or His tabernacle with us, shall have no end. We know Him only as Immanuel. Every reference, or nearly every reference, to His pre-existent state connects Him with man as man's predestined Head. Certainly every one of our Lord's own allusions does this. Let His last word stand for all: the glory which I had with Thee before the world was; 2 where the I of Him who prays, addressing the Father and not man, is the Incarnate I, transferred as it were and carried up into eternity. It is true that the exinanition, or self-emptying, which St. Paul attributes to the Son while as yet in the form of God, 3 preceded the incarnation in the Divine counsel. But that surrender of the manifestation of His glory was only a purpose until the actual descent; and must not be included in the Messianic humiliation that followed upon earth. The estates of humiliation and exaltation belong to the Incarnate Person as He is the Christ, and in the world of human affairs. As the Eternal Son, in the bosom of the Father, 4 He could not be abased, though He might be emptied of His glory. There is a distinction between the acts of Divine condescension and the acts of Divine-human humiliation: found in fashion as aMan 1:5 the Lord might humble Himself; but not before. It belongs to the freedom of the Divine Being that He can, in a certain sense, limit Himself if He will: for instance, the Triune God becomes the Author of a universe that existed not before His will added it to His self-manifestation; and He condescends to specific relations with the creature, though Himself the Absolute God. But in this condescension there is no humiliation. So also, though the analogy is imperfect, One Person in the Godhead, by Whom were all things created, 6 might condescend and has condescended to unite Himself with His creature

Hence His assumption of our human NATURE as such is not of the essence of His humiliation: it was His literal assumption of the FLESH in the miraculous conception that added the element of self-abasement 1 1 Corinthians 15:28; 2 John 17:5; 3 Php 2:6; 4 John 1:18; 5 Php 2:8; 6 Colossians 1:16 THE FUNDAMENTAL BASIS OF THE REDEEMING WORK The Incarnation is not so much one of the stages or acts of the Redeemer's history as the necessary basis of all. By incarnation is here meant, not the literal taking of our flesh, but that union with our nature to which the Scripture does not give a name. The truth on this subject also may be stated in two propositions. The assumption of our manhood by a Divine Person was the accomplishment of the purpose of salvation; it was also the means in order to that salvation. These two are inseparable 1. When the Son of God became man the human race was declared to be a saved race The ancient predictions concerning His advent into the flesh always announced His coming as that of a Redeemer and Deliverer who had already saved the world in purpose and in effect. The first Gospel declared that the Seed of the woman should bruise the Serpent's head. The entire strain of the Psalms and Prophecies predicts the coming of One Whose coming was deliverance: so the great Fulfillment says, He hath visited and redeemed His people.1 The most distinct and emphatic

prophecy of the birth of Jesus unites in one sentence unto us a Child is born and His name shall be called The Mighty God, The Prince of Peace. 2 The first New-Testament name of Jesus is Immanuel, God with us. 3 The song of the angels heralds a Savior whose advent is the pledge of an accomplished salvation. To say all in one word, the incarnation of Christ is never regarded as one stage in a work that is to be wrought, however true that may in a certain sense be. Certainly there is no hint of any uncertainty or contingency in the issue: thus it must be 4 reigns over all the mission which He who voluntarily came in the flesh undertook 1 Luke 1:68; 2 Isaiah 9:6; 3 Matthew 1:23; 4 Matthew 26:54 2. But the other proposition is no less true: the Incarnation was a means to an end

Though the early announcements dwell rather on the accomplishment of the Divine purpose in the gift of His Son, we find as the history of Christ proceeds more and more distinct intimations that the Savior entered the body prepared for Him in order to achieve the reconciliation by an atoning death. He who was the Mediator in His incarnate Person, exhibiting in Himself the union of God and mankind, must also be the Mediator in His sacrificial work, effecting or realizing that ideal union. The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many. 1 Hence, when we reach the Epistles we find that the Incarnation is always closely connected with an atoning design: not indeed generally as one stage towards the Atonement, but as essentially connected with it. JESUS is not the perfect Savior until He becomes CHRIST When the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the law, to redeem them that were under the law. 2 Our Lord is our Representative; forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood He also Himself likewise took part of the same; that through death He might nullify him that had the power of death. 3 This passage with its entire context impressively shows that the Incarnation was the way to the cross. Three terms are used, each of great importance. It was to abolish death, by taking his power from its representative and lord, that is, the devil. This, however, required that He should take our flesh in order that He might taste death for everyMan 1:4 and thus deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage: 5 this deliverance being accomplished by His sacrifice of reconciliation, as the words apallaxee and enochoi sufficiently prove. Only as man could He be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God to make expiation for the sins of the people, eis to hilaskesthai. In order to accomplish these results—the destruction of death, the reconciliation of offenders subject to death, and the propitiation required in order to both—He taketh hold of the seed of Abraham: 6 He taketh to Himself, epilambanetai, not angels, but men; mankind, however, being viewed here as the saved church of humanity, or the blessed with faithful Abraham, 7 and the seed of Abraham My friend. 8 But it was that He might taste of death uper pantos

1 Matthew 20:28; 2 Galatians 4:4; 3 Hebrews 2:14; 4 Hebrews 2:9; 5 Hebrews 2:15; Hebrews 2:17; 6 Hebrews 2:16; 7 Galatians 3:9; 8 Isaiah 41:8

3. A careful attention to the language of Scripture will help us to avoid some prevalent errors: that of those, on the one hand, who regard our Saviour’s assumption of the flesh as His first step in an experiment for human salvation, translating the cry at the end It is decided instead of It is finished; 1 and that of such, on the other, as make the Incarnation itself the bestowment of salvation on mankind, the death of the Savior being needed chiefly for its moral influence as an example; and, lastly, of many who, on Sacramental principles, give the Incarnation of our Lord an undue

preponderance, and regard the extension of that Incarnation in the life of believers as the essence—as the fountain and process and end—of the Christian life. These errors are only alluded to here: they will meet us again

1 John 19:30 THE INCARNATION IN SCRIPTURE The Scriptural references to the Incarnation are comparatively few; but they refer to it as a mystery which had more than any other been hidden from the mind of man. In the Old Testament it is the subject of dim and mysterious prophecy which only the Fulfillment has explained. In the New Testament it is historically recorded by two of the Evangelists; and, their record being presupposed, it is then theologically stated in a considerable variety of phrases which may be profitably studied and classified. As these, however, have been considered under the Person of Christ, it will be sufficient to refer to them only in a very general way

I. The Incarnation of the Son of God, the supreme fact in human history, bringing the Eternal Generation into a human birth in time, was an event which the Spirit of prophecy never revealed until it took place. There is no one word in the Old Testament which plainly declared that God would become Man. On the other hand, there is no event recorded in the New Testament that is more expressly and variously announced as the accomplishment of ancient oracles

1. This paradox is partly solved by an examination of the predictions themselves which foreannounce the coming of a Divine Seed born NOT OF THE WILL OF MAN, BUT OF GOD.1 Only the fullness of the time2 — therefore the fullness of time because this was its great secret—declared why it was said, not of the seed of Adam but of the seed of Eve, It shall bruise thy head; 3 and now we know that the Incarnation was the first accent of prophecy

Many later predictions spoke of the Seed of Abraham and of David; but the New Testament explains that the line of Abraham and David furnished only the human mother of our Lord. Isaiah, who sheds so clear a light on the earthly end of the Messiah, sheds a light equally clear on His earthly beginning: Behold, a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call His name Immanuel. 4 This oracle also veiled its own meaning. A certain ambiguity in the term almaah has always been wrested by the Jews to the suppression of the truth, as by Kimchi: " non est virgo sed puella. Puella vero haec uxor prophetae, vel uxor Achazi, quod probabilius videtur." It was never charged against the enemies of Christ that they misunderstood this and some other passages: such as, Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given, 5 and the testimony of the Servant of the Lord to Himself, the Lord hath called Me from, the womb; from the bowels of My mother hath He made mention of My name. 6 But these are all with the utmost exactness explained in the New Testament of the Incarnation of the Son of God 1 John 1:13; 2 Galatians 3:13; 3 Genesis 3:15; 4 Isaiah 7:14; 5 Isaiah 9:6; 6 Isaiah 49:1

2. Another solution may be found in the fact that the ancient revelation was pervaded by a certain presentiment of the appearance of God in human form. The early Theophanies, or manifestations of the Supreme, were in the likeness of men. The Angel of Jehovah, or the Angel of the Face, had, so to speak, the form of the Son of man. The general anthropomorphic style of the Old Testament was a perpetual indirect prophecy of the Incarnation. The same Jehovah who constantly interdicted the formation of any image of Himself — ye saw no similitude, only ye heard a voice 1 — nevertheless commanded His people to seek His face. 2 The WISDOM of the Proverbs is so described as to suggest the coming revelation of a Personal Representative of the Godhead

dwelling by more than a mere Divine influence with the sons of men.3 The supreme SERVANT OF JEHOVAH in Isaiah is all but declared to be Jehovah in human form. It is certain that the later Judaism did, in a confused manner, grope its way towards this truth; misinterpreting these hints and the symbols with which they were connected. Not to dwell upon this, the Christian reader of the Old Testament—and only to the Christian reader does it yield its true teaching—feels everywhere that time is laboring with a secret that is ready to be revealed: IMMANUEL, 4 GOD WITH US. This, however, must not be carried too far. When the Dayspring arose the world was not prepared to comprehend it. St. Paul furnishes his testimony in a remarkable passage which looks both ways. God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of [Jesus] Christ.5 This is the Face or Divine Presence which shines everywhere by anticipation in the Old Testament; but its revelation in the New is, as it were, light arising in darkness 1 Deuteronomy 4:12; 2 Psalms 105:4; 3 Proverbs 8:31; 4 Matthew 1:23; 5 2 Corinthians 4:6

3. There are some passages in Scripture which suggest the question how far the uncorrected traditions of men, perverting the original promise, expected an incarnate God as the Desire of all nations, 1 or that the gods might come down to us in the likeness of men. 2 It cannot be doubted that no thought is more universal in mythology than that of the union of Divinity with humanity: whether by the apotheosis of man, ascending to the fellowship of the gods; or by the descent of Divine beings to earth. The science of Comparative Theology is able to adduce evidence from all parts of the world, and from every age, that a dim presentiment of the Incarnation has existed among men; but, generally speaking, strangely blended with the notion of metempsychosis and transmigration

Among the Egyptians animals, rather than man, were the medium. The mythology of the Hindus exhibits a boundless variety of incarnations or avatars: one of which, that of Krishna, represents the Deity as man bruising the head of a serpent, while the serpent bites his heel. Buddhism was based upon a Pantheistic evolution of the Infinite in the finite the object of which was to destroy sacrificial religion, and lead the spirit back to its original abyss. Lamaism in Tibet added the idea of hereditary incarnations. The classical metamorphoses exhibited the notion in its most degraded form, though the name given to Jupiter. Zeus katabatoos, maintains the truth that underlay the perversion. Scandinavian mythology has its many variations on the same thought. And so also have the American religions, especially that of Mexico, which contains unmistakable traditions of an incarnation of the highest god through a human mother. The thoughtful study of all these, and numberless other, fantasies of heathenism, will force upon the mind a conviction that the original promise of the Seed of the woman had been diffused among all nations, responding to the profound instinct of mankind longing for communion with a personal God, but left to its unregulated groping until the fullness of the time 1 Haggai 2:7; 2 Acts 14:11

II. The Incarnation as an accomplished fact was in due time committed to record by two chosen writers, St. Matthew and St. Luke, who, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, collected and made permanent the sacred tradition of the first disciples: the one representing the Jews, the other the Gentiles

1. The narrative itself is the most wonderful in human annals. It is given in two forms: by St. Matthew, less as an historical account than as an exhibition of the fulfillment of prophecy; by St.

Luke, as an avowed narrative of the fundamental event in human redemption. The most searching criticism is constrained to admit that the chapters of the Incarnation have precisely the same authority as the rest of the books in which they appear. No history in Scripture is more clear and explicit than that which narrates the miraculous advent of the Son of God as the Divinely-begotten Son of a human mother

Superficial objections may be raised against the narratives themselves, especially as compared with each other; but, to those who believe in the Incarnation first, and who believe secondly in the superintendence of the Spirit over the preservation of its record, those objection vanish. St. Matthew begins with the Abrahamic and Davidic descent of the Messiah; and then describes His birth and infant history as the fulfillment of five distinct Old-Testament prophecies, omitting much that a mere chronicler would have inserted. He gives the, public registry of the Davidic descent of Joseph, son of David, 1 s privileges being inherited by Jesus, concerning Whose birth of Mary, however, the language suddenly changes: ton andra Marias ez ees agennbotho toosous, IMMANUEL, GOD WITH US. St. Luke adopts a new and evangelical method of his own in giving the genealogy. He traces it upward through Heli, the father of Mary, through all generations of men to God Himself: we must read his words, being a son (as was supposed, of Joseph) of Heli; 2 e son being the grandson, through Mary. St. Luke makes Mary the centre, and the Incarnation is for all the world, that of the Seed of the woman. St. Matthew makes Joseph the centre, and the Incarnation is that of the Son of David, the Christ. The details of the harmony need not here be entered into. Suffice that the two records may be woven into one continuous history of the supernatural advent, conception and birth of the Son of God in humanity. And this history records an event which, in its essential character, had never entered into the mind of man 1 Matthew 1:20; 2 Luke 3:23

2. It is remarkable that after this most full and explicit narrative, the mystery of the miraculous conception by which God became incarnate is never once alluded to. But it is always presupposed, and in such a variety of ways as to confirm the truth of the record which the subsequent silence of the New Testament is supposed to contradict. In fact, the decorum of Scripture treats this supreme Miracle with a reticent dignity that gives a law to us: proofs are abundant of the death and of the resurrection and even of the Divinity of the Redeemer, but His generation in the flesh of man is left to the vindication of God

Direct evidences we are forbidden to seek for; the indirect abound everywhere in the Gospels themselves. For with God nothing shall be impossible: 1 this one word should be a sufficient answer to all possible preliminary objections that sense or reason may urge But Mary kept all these things, and pondered them in her heart: 2 this sentence sheds light upon much that follows. The blessed Mother of our Lord was the human custodian of the mystery, nor did she depart until the light of Pentecost confirmed her witness; though a veil, which we must not penetrate, falls upon her communications. It was part of our Lord’s lowliness to bear the reproach which sprang from the paradox of His human birth: His cross began from His conception, and His mother bore it with Him, the sword piercing her soul also from the beginning as well as at the end. 3 This reproach He has endured at the hands of both Gentiles and Jews to this day; but reverence forbids our further examination of it. Once more, the silence of our Lord and His disciples as to the fact may be explained on the general principle that the Divinity of the Redeemer was to be independently demonstrated, and that again would demonstrate His Divine birth

Lastly, the supreme evidence of the Human Conception was reserved until it was perfected in the resurrection, with which birth from the dead St. Paul connects the ancient word: Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee! 4 The Person and the Work of the Incarnate Son were both consummated then: He was at length perfectly raised up and begotten in our nature. Meanwhile, whatever His disciples knew, Jesus Himself always spoke and acted as One who made of a woman 5 knew that God was His only Father: evidence of which abounds from His first testimony to Himself, Wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business? 6 down to the end, He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father!7 1 Luke 1:37; 2 Luke 2:19; 3 Luke 2:35; 4 Acts 13:33; 5 Galatians 4:4; 6 Luke 2:49; 7 John 14:9

3. The Fact of the Incarnation is throughout the later Scriptures referred to in a variety of ways: always as the basis of the entire Mediatorial economy. The classification which is theologically most useful is perhaps that which views it in relation to the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity respectively

(1.) The Father, or, what is in the New Testament the same, God, is connected with the miraculous entrance of the Son into human nature only in a general manner. He is said to have sent forth HisSong of Solomon 1:1-17born of a woman and in the likeness of sinful flesh; 2 and, especially, to have raised up HisSong of Solomon 3:1-11 among men. This day have I begotten Thee 4 refers to the incarnation only as it is perfected in the resurrection: the raising up of the advent and the raising up from the dead thus encircle the whole historical manifestation of the Son of Man Who is [the Lord] from heaven.5 1 Galatians 4:4; 2 Romans 8:3; 3 Acts 3:26; 4 Acts 3:33; 5 1 Corinthians 15:47

(2.) The relation of the Son Himself to His Incarnation is carefully to be studied. It was His voluntary act. He condescended to be made flesh, but only as God who dwelt among us: 1 these sayings must be blended, as mutually qualifying each other. He came into the flesh and He came in flesh: 2 these also have their several shades of meaning. He taketh hold of the seed of Abraham and took part of the same flesh and blood of which the children are partakers: 3 these also are mutually complementary. It must be noted that in this series of counterparts the active and the passive side of the Son's assumption and submission are made emphatic. As to the latter He says, a body hast Thou prepared Me;4 as to the former, I came down from heaven not to do Mine own will, 5 and Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of Me,) to do Thy will, 0 God. 6 1 John 1:14; 2 1 John 4:3; 3 Hebrews 2:14; Hebrews 2:16; 4 Hebrews 10:5; 5 John 6:38; 6 Hebrews 10:7

(3.) That Body was prepared by the Third Person of the Trinity whose relations to this mystery of godliness is theologically the most important. The Son sent of the Father, and voluntarily coming to His own new nature, is yet CONCEIVED OF THE HOLY GHOST. Into the subordinate question which here arises, as to the relation between the Son's assumption and the Spirit's preparation of the Humanity, we dare not enter at large. A few suggestions only may be reverently made. The human nature of our Lord must be separate, from sinners: 1 in the Christian economy the Third Person is the Sanctifier; He hallowed the flesh into which our Lord entered, and also so sanctified the Virgin Mother as to make her meet for her high function. Again, the act of the Holy Ghost demonstrated that the Redeemer became literally Man among men, and did not bring from heaven His pre-existing humanity, as many affirm that He did. Once more, the Spirit's relation to the new

manhood laid the basis of the Redeemer’s subordination. In the unsearchable mystery of our Lord’s Person, while His human nature is His own, and one with His Divinity, it is also a human nature which is to be led of the Spirit through all its processes to the end. Hence, lastly, the Holy Ghost has a specific relation to His humanity as it is received on behalf of the race with which He is allied. The Spirit of the Son, out of Whose fullness we all receive, is the Holy Ghost Who created and dwells in His human nature from the beginning; and is the sacred link between us and our Head, even as He is the sacred bond between us all and the Father. These are interior subtitles of the Redemptional economy of the Triune God which none who would understand the Scriptures may despise, though none can find them out unto perfection

1 Hebrews 7:26

20. Vol 02 - Historical Manifestation of the Redeemer

Historical Manifestation of the Redeemer HISTORICAL MANIFESTATION OF THE REDEEMER: THE TWO ESTATES Humbled and Exalted THE HUMILIATION, as to the Redeemer's Person

Exinanition the Humiliation as to His Work Subordination, Passion, and Death THE ESTATE OF EXALTATION its Stages the Descensus the Resurrection as to the Redeemer's Person and Work as to His Incarnation and the Evidences of Religion the Ascension and Session SCRIPTURAL DEVELOPMENT HISTORICAL THEORIES OF THE TWO ESTATES Monothelitism Adoptianism

Nihilianism Necessity of Incarnation Lutheran Communicatio Idiomatum and Ubiquity Krypsis and Kenosis

Depotentiation Modern Theories and Speculations THE THREE OFFICES THE CHRIST OF PROPHECY Anointing Symbol;

Messianic Predictions of Scripture Moulded in Later Judaism Expectation of the Christ THE CHRIST OF FULFILMENT The Personal Unction

One Mediator The Official Unction Baptism of John and of Holy Spirit Gradual Assumption of Offices THE PROPHETIC OFFICE

Personal

Permanent

Universal THE PRIESTLY OFFICE The High Priest, and His Function The Sacrifice Its Rites Presentation, Sprinkling, Burning, Meal Its Various Kinds Burnt-offerings, Peace-offerings,

Sin-offerings.

All united in Christ Sacrificial Seasons Passover, Day of Atonement, Combined Intercession and Benediction the Jewish and Christian Temples THE REGAL OFFICE

Prediction

Assumption

Function The process of the Saviour's history passes through two stages of Humiliation and Exaltation, and His mediatorial work divides into three branches as He is Prophet, Priest, and King THE TWO ESTATES The history of the Redeemer is the history of redemption; and the history of redemption fills, so far as concerns man, both eternity and time, both heaven and earth. The stages of the Lord's progression, most comprehensively viewed, have, to speak paradox, no beginning and no end. His goings were from everlasting. From His pretemporal, eternal existence, He descended to become the second Head of mankind; was for ages an unrevealed Reality in human affairs; in the fullness of time became incarnate; finished His work upon earth; ascended into heaven; and will, when His work is a second time finished, assume a final manifestation which

only the day will declare. Thus His estates are manifold. But as the revealed Redeemer, as the Christ under the burden of His Messianic office, His estates are two: that of Humiliation and that of Exaltation THE ESTATE OF HUMILIATION The Estate of Humiliation may be viewed, first, with regard to our Lord's Person, and, secondly, with regard to His work: a distinction, however, which must not be too precisely maintained, inasmuch as the two are inseparable HUMILIATION OF THE INCARNATE PERSON The humiliation of the Person of Christ began with His miraculous conception, and ended with His session at the right hand of God. But it may be unfolded as the humble development of His human nature, and the obscuration of the Divine and personal Sonship

I. Our Lord took our manhood in its sinless perfection; but under the law of its development, and with the natural infirmities to which sin had reduced it

1. The term Development, as applied to human nature in contradistinction from the Divine, and also as differenced from the angelic, is of wide application. Humanity has a purely physical development: the beginning of which was not in the first man, who passed only through its later stages. It has an intellectual development, pertaining to the soul as acting in bodily organization. It has a moral development: which, though we know it only as a restoration from sin to holiness, may be predicated of sinless human nature. It has an historical development: the union of all the former processes in the accomplishment of the end destined for mankind in the eternal idea. To all these our Lord submitted. He might have assumed our nature in its ultimate perfection; but then the design of redemption would have been either unpurposed or unaccomplished. He took into personal union with Himself the germ of all that is called Man; and in His sacred Person the human nature was unfolded to its final perfectness in His ascension. He was found in fashion as a man; 1 even as we shall hereafter be found conformed to the fashion of His glorified humanity

1 Php 2:8

2. Our Lord's manhood was subject to the infirmities of our mortal condition. He was sent in the likeness of sinful flesh. 1 Sin bruised His heel before He bruised its head. He was a Man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief, 2 in a lower as well as in a higher sense: He experienced, that is, the griefs and sorrows of our common human condition which we can understand as well as the griefs and sorrows of His Messianic burden which pass our knowledge. After recording His descent from the Mount, St. Matthew begins his record of His miraculous cures of human disease by quoting the prophecy concerning the Righteous Servant: Himself; took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses. 3 This passage has no other design than to include our physical distress in the benefit of the great vicarious intervention. The Scripture preserves the silence of Divine decorum as to the literal participation of our Lord in the ills of the flesh. But it reveals to us His humiliation in assuming a nature of itself unshielded from infirmity 1 Romans 8:3; 2 Isaiah 53:3; 3 Matthew 8:17; Isaiah 53:4

3. The communion of natures, or their incomprehensible union in one Person, requires us to regard both the development and the infirmity of the lower nature as the humiliation of the Son Incarnate. That an integral part of Himself should pass from stage to stage towards perfection, and in that passage should be marred as well as perfected, was the voluntary abasement of the Eternal Son: after being, found in fashion as a man, He HUMBLED HIMSELF; 1 and that particular element of humility, which pre-ceded and was the condition of every other, did not cease until the

heavens received Him to glory

1 Php 2:8

II. Nor must we shrink from applying the term humiliation to our Lord's Person as Divine: not to His Divinity, which is immutable Eternal Spirit; but to His Person as Divine-human, and therefore to the Divinity as hiding for a season the manifestation of its glory under the veil of the flesh

1. We must begin with a qualification. If, in the Person of the Mediator, we require the verity of the unchanged Manhood, much more must we insist upon the verity of the unchangeable Godhead. Sound theology is as tenacious of the Divine as of the human reality in the One Christ. Any theory of the Redeemer's humiliation which assumes the possibility of His relinquishment or even suppression of any Divine attribute is selfcondemned

Much more must we reject any theory that would make the Eternal Son voluntarily reduce or retract His Divine Self into an abstract potency or principle made concrete in human nature. It is only due honor to the God Who was manifest in the flesh1 that this proposition should be left undefended: God in Christ is immutable, the same yesterday and to-day and for ever.2 1 1 Timothy 3:16; 2 Hebrews 8:8

2. But the Person of the Christ was humbled during His sojourn on earth; and that humiliation continued until He finally entered the heavens. Hence while the Son tabernacled with us He did not in the exercise of His ministry and in the work of redemption manifest His Divine attributes beyond the extent to which His perfect human nature might be the organ of their manifestation. The glory as of the Only-begotten 1 witnessed by the Apostles was only what might be seen in the Incarnate Person: He manifested forth His glory, 2 but not to the uttermost. This may be more clearly formulated in three ways 1 John 1:14; 2 John 2:11

(1.) The Incarnate Son was SUBORDINATE TO THE FATHER in a specific humiliation which did not continue, as touching His Person, after the ascension. Undoubtedly there is a sense in which His subordination still continues, as there is a sense also in which it will continue for ever in His fellowship with human nature. But, until the hour when He could say, all power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth, 1 He was, as the Servant of God and of man, in a deeply humbled and very special state of subjection. From the first words concerning His mission, / must be in My Father's will, 2 down to the last, My Father is greater than I, 3 this truth rules all the Redeemer's relations to His God and our God 1 Matthew 28:18; 2 Luke 2:49; 3 John 14:28

(2.) He was UNDER THE GUIDANCE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT during His earthly life rather than under the independent agency of His Divine personality. Our Lord's human nature was sealed and consecrated and enriched with sevenfold perfection by the Spirit given to Him not by measure.1 This particular subordination ceased when He who received became the Giver of the Holy Ghost: indeed, it may be said to have ceased when the Redeemer laid down His life OF HIMSELF, and through the ETERNAL SPIRIT, 2 His own essential Divinity, offered Himself to God for us. Until then, however, the Son as such did not act through His human nature alone. His own Divine supremacy is in abeyance, and, as the Representative of man, He is, like us, led of the Spirit.3 1 John 3:34; 2 Hebrews 9:14; 3 Galatians 5:18 (3.) Hence the marked prominence which He gave always to His

HUMAN NATURE as the organ of His self-revelation. Until the ascension, He spoke of Himself chiefly as the Son of Man: a title which at once declares His unity with the human race as its Representative and His submission to humanity as the sphere, and as it were the only sphere, of His temporary and temporal self-manifestation

These are the elements and factors in the humiliation of the Divine-human Person. Their combination presents to us an un-fathomable mystery. Separately and conjointly they pervade the evangelical narrative, and equally the later Scripture based upon it. From deeper and bolder investigation we are repelled by the limitation of our faculties

Moreover, all that can be further said must needs occupy attention when the humiliation of the Redeemer's work is considered, and the historical controversies on the subject rise before us HUMILIATION OF THE REDEEMING WORK

Viewed in relation to His work the humbled estate of Christ began with His baptism and ended with His descent through death into Hades. It may be regarded as His personal submission to be the Representative of a sinful race; and as His obedience to the Father's redeeming will. These converge to His Passion and Death, in which the Redeemer's humiliation was perfected THE REPRESENTATIVE OF SINNERS That our Lord humbled Himself to be the REPRESENTATIVE OF SINFUL MAN is the first key to the solution of His entire history on earth. God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law; 1 made under law generally, the Mosaic only included; and made under law: genómenon, the same aorist participle that is used for the Incarnation, thus showing that He was born under conditions of law. Now Christ was man, the Seed of the woman, before He was Jewish man, the Seed of David: as the Seed of Abraham He was both in one

1 Galatians 4:4

1. The history of the Messiah gives us His humiliation as exhibited in His Israelitish relations first; or rather His human humiliation first under its Israelitish aspect. Of this His CIRCUMCISION was the sign and seal. THAT HOLY THING1—our Lord's human nature— underwent the rite that signified at once initiation into the Hebrew covenant and the obligation to put away human sin. This rite was in the case of our Lord the symbol of all obligation to the old law until He Himself abrogated it, and His unconscious submission to the imputation of sin even as His baptism was His conscious submission to it. Hence He was presented in the Temple, though Greater than the Temple; became in His twelfth year a Son of the law; and honored down to the end every Divine ordinance and legitimate tradition in the old economy

1 Luke 1:35

2. But He was the Representative of sinful mankind. When He appeared unto Israel He appeared to the race of man. His Baptism and Temptation were of universal import in this respect. He came to His BAPTISM as the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of THE WORLD:1 though sinless, and incapable of sin, He was in the river Jordan already numbered with the transgressors. 2 Not until He had thus fulfilled the requirement of all righteousness 3 did He receive the attestation from heaven which declared that sin had nothing in Him otherwise than as imputed. In the TEMPTATION, also, He represented the sinning race; while He demonstrated that in Him is no sin, 4 nor the possibility of sin

He repelled temptation as the Son of God incarnate, Who, by the necessity of His Divine personality, could not be tempted with evil; 5 but He repelled it in terms of human rejection, giving His example to tempted mortals by the use of Scripture appropriate to sinners. He was made under law in this sense too, that He underwent the human probationary test in which He was not found wanting. In the SINLESS HOLINESS of His life, also, He was the Representative of sinful humanity: presenting to God the perfect obedience due from mankind, and to man the perfect example which, through the virtue of His expiatory death, man should be able to imitate. But here we must modify the sense in which He was under law. It is the characteristic of evangelical righteousness that it is not under the law; 6 that its obedience is from within; and if this is true of the servants, much more was it true of the Master. His holiness was not the fulfillment of duty imposed on Him; but the new and Divine expression in His life of the commandment itself In Him, as in us, it was the perfect love of God and perfect charity to man: love in Him, as in us, was the fulfilling of the law. 7 Finally, in His VICARIOUS PASSION, in His voluntary endurance of the penalty of human sin, He was the Representative of sinners: literally made under the law. 8 How literally is proved by three passages, which may be combined into one: Christ was made sin for us. Who knew no sin; 9 hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; 10 was made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law.11

1 John 1:29; 2 Isaiah 53:12; 3 Matthew 3:15; 4 1 John 3:5; 5 James 1:13; 6 Romans 6:14; 7 Romans 13:10; 8 Galatians 4:4; 9 2 Corinthians 5:21; 10 Galatians 3:13; 11 Galatians 4:4-5

3. Being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself: 1 the voluntary humiliation which made the Holy One a Representative of sinners extended over His whole life. It is impossible to point to any crisis when it began. The shadow of His cross fell upon His entire path, though it did not betray its influence on His thoughts and feelings and words until the hour approached; until about the period when from the Tabor of His transfiguration He lifted up His eyes and saw the Moriah of His sacrifice, after which He began to speak to His disciples of His coming betrayal and death. Nor dare we curiously inquire into the secrets of our Lord’s internal consciousness as bearing this relation to mankind. Suffice that through this His visage was so marred more than any man; that this made Him a Man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief. 2 To be numbered with the transgressors; and that, not only by the transgressors themselves, but by His Father, Who put Him to grief! 3 1 Php 2:8; 2 Isaiah 52:14; 3 Isaiah 53:3; Isaiah 53:12; Isaiah 53:10

OBEDIENCE

All this finds its fuller Scriptural expression in the OBEDIENCE which the Incarnate Son rendered to the Mediatorial Will of the Father. The term is generally limited to the active and passive righteousness; but, before considering it in that more restricted sense, we may refer it to the general subordination of the Redeemer during the whole course of His humbled estate

1. He who is the Lord of all entered the world as the Servant of God. I came down from heaven, not to do Mine own mil, but the will of Him that sent Me. 1 He was under a discipline of submission peculiar to His person and office. The commandment received of My Father 2 was one not written in any code of laws appointed for man, but belonged only to Himself. In keeping that great Messianic commandment He was alone: the law was one and unique, the obedience one and unique. This supreme submission is the theory of the Redeemer’s history on earth. It explains His invariable deference to the Father: My Father is greater than I; 3 His references to God as distinct

from Himself: there is none good but one, that is, God; 4 His abnegation of the use of Divine names and attributes: but of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father; 5 His calling the Father His God: I ascend unto My Father, and your Father, and to My God, and your God; 6 and His habitual adherence to the title Son of Man. All this is profoundly consistent with His Divine prerogatives apart from the subordination. As the Son of God He is equal with God, knoweth all things, and claims equal honor with the Father. In His mysterious subordination He is the Servant of the Holy Trinity, and the current of His self-revelation is faithful to that fundamental principle of His mission 1 John 14:28; 2 John 10:18; 3 John 14:28; 4 Matthew 19:17; 5 Mark 13:32; 6 John 20:17

2. But the Obedience of Christ may be more specifically viewed as the one great act of reparation to the Divine law which He accomplished on the behalf of mankind: His Active and Passive Righteousness, which are one. In His active obedience He perfectly fulfilled the obligation of righteousness as the love of God and man; and thus it was proved that His atonement was not needed for Himself. In His passive obedience He endured the penalty of human transgression. But the relation of His one obedience to the Atonement and our justification must be reserved for a later stage. Meanwhile it is sufficient to mark the three cardinal passages in which it is referred to. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of One shall many be made righteous: 1 this includes the whole mediatorial work of Christ as the Second Adam, superabounding against the sin of the race in the First Adam. Though He were a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered: 2 this makes His great submission the voluntary act of the Eternal Son, Who needed it not for Himself. Being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross: 3 this makes it the Divine-human act of the Redeemer consummated in death.Uniting the three, we gather that the entire obedience of our Savior was one work, that it was the act of the Divine Son, but voluntarily rendered in the nature of mankind 1 Romans 5:19; 2 Hebrews 5:8; 3 Php 2:8 THE PASSION AND DEATH THE DEATH of Christ was His perfect humiliation. Its atoning character will be hereafter dwelt upon. For the present we must consider it as an act of supreme submission, selfrenunciation, and abasement. It was His Passion generally, and His Crucifixion in particular

1. The Passion or Suffering of the Redeemer must be separated in thought from the precise manner of His decease. He was obedient unto death. 1 His soul was exceeding sorrowful, even unto death. 2 He was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death.

3 This was the penalty of human sin: not the destruction of soul and body merely, but that severance of the spirit from God the uttermost terrors of which no mortal has ever known. It was this which our Lord underwent. His physical dissolution was after the manner of men: not of that did He say, Behold and see if there be any sorrow like unto My sorrow! 4 His passion, or suffering, as a voluntary sacrifice for sin, brought with it the death of the body as one of its effects. That crisis would have taken place in Gethsemane—for there its awful signs began —but His hour was not yet come. In His Old-Testament lamentation the future Redeemer cries, Reproach hath broken My heart.5 The blood and water 6 which followed the piercing after death gave token that this was literally true. Though it was ordered that a bone of Him shall not be broken, 7 this did not extend to the fleshy protection of His sacred heart, rent by the pressure of intolerable woe. Thus far our own human experience gives us light. But no further: the appeal, My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me? 8 was the exceeding bitter cry that sprang from the Redeemer's infinite perception

of what lies in eternal abandonment by God That was the death of redemption

1 Php 2:8; 2 Matthew 27:38; 3 Hebrews 2:9; 4 Lamentations 1:12; 5 Psalms 69:20; 6 John 19:34; 7 John 19:36; 8 Mark 15:34

2. The death of the Redeemer cannot, however, be separated from His Crucifixion. He became obedient unto death, EVEN THE DEATH OF THE CROSS.1 he sacred details of the scene of which the cross is the centre are given by all the Evangelists, who here at last converge to a perfect unity: the harmony of their narrative is broken by a few seeming contradictions, which appear on a superficial view, but vanish before deeper investigation. The only one of these that deserves mention is the apparent difference between the Synoptists and St. John as to the actual day of our Lord's death. Collating their several accounts with St. Paul's to the Corinthians—Christ OUR PASSOVER was sacrificed for us, 2 it were on 14th Nisan, and rose THE FIRST FRUITS, 3 as it were on the 16th Nisan—and marking that the Synoptists speak of the day of crucifixion as the Preparation 4 of the great Sabbath of 15th Nisan, and not on the feast day itself, 5 we are led to the conclusion that the Last Supper was, as St. John records, before the feast of the Passover, 6 and that the Crucifixion took place on Friday, the 14th Nisan. The disciples who, according to the Synoptists, on the first day of the Feast of unleavened bread, put their question, Where wilt Thou that ice prepare for Thee to eat the Passover? 7 prepared the meal on the 14th Nisan, but before the 13th had ended, that is, on the evening of Thursday, the 13th Nisan, and on that same evening the Lord anticipated the Passover which He so much desired to eat 8 with them. The exact date of the world's redemption may, with near approach to absolute certainty, be assigned to the Friday, 18th March, 14th Nisan, in the year of Rome 782, A.D. 29

1 Php 2:8; 2 1 Corinthians 5:7; 3 1 Corinthians 15:23; 4 Luke 23:54; 5 Matthew 26:5; 6 John 13:1; 7 Matthew 26:17; 8 Luke 22:15 3. Viewing the Passion in its relation to the Crucifixion, we may venture to make a few further remarks

(1.) As entering into the fulfillment of the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, 1 the crucifixion may be said to have been an accident of the Passion. The Father made the soul of His Servant an offering for sin, 2 and His Son sin for us; 3 but in what way that oblation should be offered was predetermined only in the foresight of human malignity. The immolation on Calvary is never spoken of save as the act of man. The shame and ignominy of the cross was endured by Jesus as the expression of man's rejection: by wicked hands 4 He was crucified and slain. The princes of this world, in their ignorance and in the infamy: of their pride, crucified the Lord of glory. 5 But this was foreseen and made the subject of type and prophecy; though of such type and prophecy as required the event for their full explanation. It was the death that was predestined; the cross was only foreknown: a distinction sustained by the usage of Scripture 1 Acts 2:23; 2 Isaiah 53:10; 3 2 Corinthians 5:21; 4 Acts 2:23; 5 1 Corinthians 2:8

(2.) The crucifixion of our Lord was, therefore, the fulfillment of prophecy: whether the acted prophecy of type or the spoken prophecy of prediction. Isaac, the only son of Abraham, bore the wood of the burnt offering 1 to Mount Moriah, even as the Onlybegotten bore His cross. The serpent lifted up in the wilderness was the type of the Son of Man lifted up. 2 While the prophets fore-announced the sacrifice of the Lamb, they indicated that His death would be unlike that of the ancient victim. He was WOUNDED for our transgressions. 3 They shall look upon Me Whom they have PIERCED; 4 and they PIERCED My hands and My feet. 5 These words were spoken as from

the heart of Jesus in the Old Testament. It was reserved for Himself to utter the first express prediction of the Cross, which He had hinted at to Nicodemus, but began to speak of, for Himself and all His followers, when He was about to ascend the Mount on which He lifted up His eyes and saw His Other Mount in the distance. 6 The history of the crucifixion shows that the minutest details were ordered as it had been written concerning Him: signifying what death, poíoo thanátoo, He should die.7 1 Genesis 22:6; 2 John 3:14; 3 Isaiah 53:5; 4 Zechariah 12:10; 5 Psalms 22:16; 6 John 12:33; 7 John 18:32

(3.) The Providence took up into its plans the death of the Cross as that which alone could unite the whole world in its perpetration. To this end was I born, He said—and we may add for this purpose He died—to bear witness unto the truth. 1 He was a Martyr to the eternal truth of God. And His martyrdom was the act of the world which, like Satan its prince, abode not in the truth. 2 It was the deed of the Jews, for they delivered Him to Pilate; it was the deed of the Gentiles, for they alone crucified their malefactors. The combined wicked hands of mankind universal cast out the Eternal Word. They CONSCIOUSLY rejected the Divine Witness; they UNCONSCIOUSLY offered up the Eternal Victim, and consummated the world's iniquity in the very act which obtained the world's salvation. He who knew what was in man prayed for them: they know not what they do! 3 1 John 18:37; 2 John 8:44; 3 Luke 23:34

4. Hence the cross was to our High Priest simply the awful form which His altar assumed. His own Self bare our sins in His own body on the tree:1 epi to xulon, as St. Peter invariably terms the Cross, and he only. The most affecting type of the Eternal Son incarnate bore the wood on his shoulders to his Calvary, and that wood became the altar on which in a figure 2 he was slain, and from which in a figure he was raised again. St Peter has indicated this in the most impressive phrase of the New Testament, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, not mentioning the cross, alludes to it when it says that Jesus suffered without the gate, 3 and that we have an altar. On that altar our High Priest offered His oblation; and put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself."4 1 1 Peter 2:24; 2 Hebrews 11:19; 3 Hebrews 13:10; Hebrews 13:12; 4 Hebrews 9:26

5. But, while the cross on which human malignity slew the Holy One is really the altar on which He offered Himself, and we forget the tree in the altar into which it was transformed, the Cross still remains as the sacred expression of the curse which fell upon human sin as represented by the Just One. God made Him to be sin for us Who knew no sin; 1 and, though it is not said that He made Him a curse for us, it is said: Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree. 2 In His Holy Person sin was represented, and its penalty endured. It was condemned in the flesh. 3 But, He who endured the cross, despising the shame, 4 thus cast down the powers of evil, triumphing over them in it. 5 His Cross is now the glory of Christianity. It is the seat whence the Prophet teaches His highest lessons. It is the altar of His continually availing sacrifice. And it is the throne of His Power as King in the universe. But the Cross is no longer His or His alone. It is Divinely in a figure transferred 6 to us. All our religion is the fellowship of His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death, 7 and bearing His reproach. 8 Our sub-exemplar said, I am crucified with Christ

1 2 Corinthians 5:21; 2 Galatians 3:13; 3 Romans 8:3; 4 Hebrews 12:2; 5 Colossians 2:15; 6 1 Corinthians 4:6; 7 Php 3:10; 8 Hebrews 13:13 LIMITS OF THE HUMILIATION The humiliation of the Redeemer, therefore, embraces the whole process of His incarnate life, from His Conception

to His Burial. These two extreme terms, however, must be carefully defined. The first requires a distinction to be made between the Incarnation and the Conception; the second, between the Burial and the Descent into Hades. (1.) The Son of God might have exhibited His incarnate Person in majesty from the beginning; in which case the Transfiguration glory would have been the rule and not the exception

But, condescending to become incarnate, He was conceived of the Holy Ghost and born after the manner of man. The distinction between the Incarnation generally, and the humble manner of His assumption of flesh, is subtle but not unimportant. (2.) And the end of His abasement was reached when He became obedient unto death. 1 Obligation went no further than the dissolution of soul and body. That separation was attested by His entombment. But the burial itself has two aspects. It was the descent of the body to the sepulcher; where the flesh of the Holy One of God saw no corruption, being still part of His incarnate Person. Humiliation was arrested at the moment that Death received the sacred Form, as the Baptist received the Heavenly Candidate for baptism: COMEST THOU TO ME? 2 Meanwhile the exaltation of the Redeemer had already begun. For, His spirit, also part of His incarnate Person, quickened by the Spirit of His Divinity, went down to the nether world and received at the very moment of its severance from the body the keys of Hades and of death. 3 1 Php 2:8; 2 Matthew 3:14; 3 Revelation 1:18 HUMILIATION OF PERSON AND WORK ONE

Having distinguished between the humiliation of our Lord’s Person and that of His work, it is expedient that we efface the distinction and regard His Person and His work as one

Apart from the ministry of redemption there is, theologically, no Person of Christ. Some important results follow from this truth: first, the redeeming submission makes the personal humiliation a profound reality; secondly, the inalienable Divine dignity of the Redeemer gives its glory to the submission

1. There is a sense in which the Person of the Incarnate, as such, was incapable of abasement. His assumption of a pure human nature, by" which the centre of His being, that is His Personality, was not changed, was an act of infinite condescension, but not of humiliation strictly so called. The self-determining or self-limiting act of the Godhead in creating all things cannot be regarded as a derogation; nor was it such in the specific union of Deity with manhood. But, as we shall hereafter see that the Descent into Hades was the moment which united the deepest abasement and the loftiest dignity of the Christ, so the moment of the incarnation in the womb of the Virgin united the most glorious condescension of the Second Person with His most profound abjection. His work began as a suffering Redeemer, with the submission to conception and birth. Hence the Person and the work cannot be separated. And the humiliation which the Redeemer underwent must be regarded as the humiliation of the God-man. He assumed it, even as He assumed the nature that rendered it possible

2. As the glory of our Lord’s Divinity was manifested forth in His Person and work, so that glory shines through all the narratives of His humbled estate. Many lesser evidences might be adduced; but we may be content with the three testimonies given by the Father from heaven at the three great crises of that humiliation, and occasional assertions of our Savior as to the voluntary and Divine character of His submission

(1.) At the Baptism, which has been hitherto viewed only as it was received by the Representative of sinners, the Divine attestation was given: This is My belovedSong of Solomon 1:1-17 Here was more than the perfect complacency of the Father in His Son now incarnate, and the acknowledgment of the sinless development of the past; it was also a symbolical exhibition of the Holy Trinity as to be revealed in redemption; and the Triune glory, though it vanished from human observation, rested for ever on the Saviour's work

Midway in His career, or rather when preparing to enter the path of final sorrow, our Lord received from God the Father honor and glory 2 on the holy mount. That glory rests, slanting along a double perspective vista, upon the two intervals, backwards to the Baptism and forward to the Passion. Whatever other lessons the Transfiguration taught, it certainly declared that the Holy Sufferer was the Divine Son; and that the brightness of the Father's glory in Him was only withdrawn or hidden, or veiled for a season. Finally, the hour of our Saviour's preparatory passion was magnified by a third demonstration of the Father's honor put upon His Son. He heard the Voice which others did not distinguish; the Voice which declared that all the past of the Redeemer had glorified the Divine Name, and that the still greater future would still more abundantly glorify it: I have both glorified it and will glorify it again. 3 1 Matthew 3:17; 2 2 Peter 1:17; 3 John 12:2

(2.) On many occasions He asserted for Himself the Divine dignity which coexisted with His humiliation. A Teacher come from God, 1 He re-uttered the law on the Mount as His own, and the entire fabric of the Sermon asserts His supremacy. While He vindicated His own observance of Sabbatic ordinance as real and true, He declared Himself Lord also of the Sabbath; 2 and, honoring the Temple prescriptions, proclaimed Himself Greater than the Temple. 3 Complying with an exaction of men as subject to the powers that be, He intimated that as the Son He was free from tribute. 4 He ever made it known that His life was in His own hands, that He did not and could not renounce the prerogative of life in Himself, 5 that He laid down His life with Divine freedom, that He had power to lay it down, and power to take it again. 6 And what He declared in life He proved in death: for, though the Father's rebuke of sin broke His heart, He spontaneously yielded up His soul, or gave up the ghost, 7 parédooken tó pneúma, even as He voluntarily gave up His body to those who came to capture Him. 8 It was part of the commandment received of My Father that our Lord should sometimes assert, what His consciousness could not be bereft of, His absolute independence of the creature with which, for the sake of redemption, He had so closely bound Himself. Hence He declares His self-abnegation to be the example 9 which He gave His disciples, nor does He ever once speak of it save for that purpose

Before He bequeathed His peace He left them this legacy, showing by its most affecting illustration in Himself the eternal connection between humility as the source and peace as the result. The Feet washing was the symbolical representation of His entire way of lowliness; and in it the Master and Lord 10 set the seal of Divine dignity on His earthly condescension. When, drawing very nigh to the lowest limit of His abasement, He said, Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me? 11 and, more than that, He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father, He Himself declared that the whole of His past career had been a manifestation of God in the flesh: I and My Father are one. 12 We have not, however, isolated passages only to rely on. The whole history of our Lord's humbled estate in the Gospels, and the exposition of it in the Epistles, alike proclaim that in the mystery of His condescension to the lowest depth His glory was revealed. As the Incarnate Son He said of Himself: Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into

His glory? 13 But the glorification of Divine love waited not for the ascension The Divine majesty of the Son was most richly and blessedly manifested IN the redeeming sorrows and not alone AFTER them. To the Christian sentiment the obscuration of the Cross is the very darkness which God makes His secret place. 14

1 John 3:2; 2 Luke 6:5; 3 Matthew 12:6; 4 Matthew 17:26; 5 John 5:26; 6 John 10:18; 7 John 19:30; 8 John 10:18; 9 John 11:15; 10 John 13:13; 11 John 14:10; John 14:9; 12 John 10:30; 13 Luke 24:26; 14 Psalms 18:11 THE ESTATE OF EXALTATION The Redeemer's Estate of Exaltation may be viewed in its historical stages as a process: the Descent, the Resurrection, and the Ascension; and with reference to its completeness as affecting the Person and the Work of the Redeemer. These, however, need not be separated: the latter branch may be merged in the former, partly because it has been anticipated in the Humiliation, and, partly, because it enters into the discussion of the Three Offices The process of the Redeemer's exaltation, like that of His humiliation, is matter of Scriptural testimony alone. We are taught that it began with the Descent into the invisible world; that it was continued in His Resurrection; and that it was consummated in His Ascension and Session at the right hand of God THE DESCENT

Between the lowest point of our Lord's humiliation and the beginning of His glorification there was, there could be, no interval. In fact, the critical instant of His death was at the same time the critical instant of His commencing triumph. Here we must consider what the Descent into Hades imports, and how it belonged to the exaltation of Christ: but in few words, as the light of Scripture here soon fails us

1. The phrase Descent into Hell, Descensus ad Inferos, is not in the New Testament. St. Peter, bearing witness to the Lord's resurrection, quotes the words of David: 1 Thou wilt not leave My soul in Hades; neither wilt thou give Thine Holy One to see corruption. 2 The Greek "Aidos Hades, answering to the Hebrew Sheol, signifies the Unseen State; which again corresponds with the English Hell, according to its simple original meaning of Covered or Hidden Depth, and without reference to punishment endured in it. Into this State of the Dead our Lord entered: as to His body it was buried and concealed in the sepulcher or visible representative of the invisible Hades into which He entered as to His soul. It is observable, however, that St. Paul, making the same use of the Psalm, does not distinguish between the grave and Hades. He speaks only of the body: they laid Him in a sepulcher; 3 and thinks it enough to quote, Thou wilt not give Thine Holy One to see corruption. Undoubtedly the entombment of our Lord, and His passing into the condition of the dead, are the one meaning of these passages; and they signify that His death was a reality, and that so far His burial belonged to His humbled estate 1 Acts 2:30-31; 2 Psalms 16:10; 3 Acts 13:29; Acts 13:35

2. But that this descent into Hades was at the same time the beginning of His exaltation is evident from the following negative and positive considerations

(1.) Negatively, when our Lord cried It is finished! 1 The abasement of the Representative of mankind ended. The expiation of sin demanded no more: it did not require that the Redeemer should be kept under the power of death. After the tribute of His voluntary expiation death had no more dominion over Him. 2 He triumphed over all the enemies of salvation on the cross. Death was at once His last sacrifice, His triumph, and His release; it was not possible that He should be holden of it: 3 not only because He was the Prince of Life, but because the law had no further

claim. When He offered up His holy spirit, wrath to the uttermost was spent upon human sin; bat He Himself was never the object of wrath, and the Father received the spirit commended to Him as a sufficient sacrifice. The Holy One could not endure the torments of the lost: the thought that He could and did is the opprobrium of one of the darkest chapters of historical theology. Not in this sense did He make His grave with the wicked.4 1 John 19:30; 2 Romans 6:9; 3 Acts 2:24; Acts 3:15; 4 Isaiah 53:9

(2.) Positively, He triumphed in death over death. First, in His one Person He kept inviolate His human body, which did not undergo the material dissolution of its elements: not because, as it is sometimes said, He was delivered from the grave before corruption had time to affect His sacred flesh; but because the work of death was arrested in the very instant of the severance of soul and body. As His spirit dieth no more, 1 so His body saw no corruption. 2 The unviolated flesh of our Lord was, till the moment He was quickened, a silent declaration of perfect victory: His Divinity never left His body, any more than it forsook His spirit in its passage to the world of spirits. Secondly, according to the testimony of two Apostles, our Lord triumphantly descended into the lower world, and took possession of the kingdom of the dead. To this end Christ both died, and, having died, lived, that He might be Lord both of the dead and living: 3 these words indefinitely distribute the mediatorial empire over man into its two great provinces. He died, and in death took possession of the Dead; He revived, and ruleth over the Living. Who shall descend into the deep?4 (that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead): here the deep, or the abyss, must refer to the great Underworld. Now that He ascended, what is it but that He also descended [first] into the lower parts of the earth? 5 whence, in the strong figure of Scripture, He led captivity captive. 6 Triumphing over all the enemies of our salvation—sin, death, and Satan—in it, the cross, He declared His triumph in the Descent. Quickened by the Spirit of His Divinity, by which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison: 7 the historical sequence—He went, by the resurrection, Who is gone into heaven—indicates, and will allow no other interpretation, that in the Interval the Redeemer asserted His authority and lordship in the vast region where the congregation of the dead 8 is the great; aggregate of mankind, the great assembly to which also we may apply the words, In the midst of the congregation will I praise Thee.9

1 Romans 6:9; 2 Acts 13:37; 3 Romans 14:9; 4 Romans 10:1-21; Romans 7:1-25; 5 Ephesians 4:8-9; 6 Colossians 2:15; 7 1 Peter 3:18-19; 1 Peter 3:22; 8 Proverbs 21:16; 9 Psalms 22:22 THE RESURRECTION The Resurrection of our Lord, viewed in its widest import, is His exaltation. It is the perfect opposite of His humbled estate. As a fact in His history it is only a stage in the process of glorification; but the general strain of the New Testament teaches us to regard it as absolutely the counterpart and antithesis of His humiliation. If His death is the limit and measure of the Obedience, His resurrection is the substance and sum of His dignity and reward. The preaching of the Apostles everywhere gives prominence to these two truths as the pillars of the Christian faith; and the evidence of the supreme miracle of the resurrection of Jesus is, both as internal and external, sufficient to establish the dignity of His Person and the authority of His work. This point of view alone commands all the elements of the doctrine of Christ’s resurrection IN ITS DOGMATIC RELATIONS The Resurrection was the glorification of the Redeemer’s Person and the seal of His atoning work

I. His rising from death Divinely vindicated the Redeemer’s Person. As such, it was the demonstration of His Divinity, as effected by His own power; and, as effected by the Father, the

declaration of His Incarnate dignity: both, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, merged into the Godhead generally

1. It is remarkable that in all our Lord's predictions of His resurrection He makes Himself the Agent. His first allusion to it was among His earliest predictions: Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up; 1 and His last was among His latest: I lay down My life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from Me, but I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down, and 1 have power to take it again. 2 It may be objected that the words follow: this commandment have I received of My Father. But the mediatorial law of obedience included both death and resurrection; and, as certainly as the commandment implied a personal voluntary surrender of life, the offering of Himself in death, so certainly it implied the personal voluntary resumption of that life. The mediatorial authority is distinct from the Divine power inherent in the Son: this latter being the foundation of the former. He who was the Seed of David after the flesh was declared to be the Son of God with power, 3 the Son of God no longer in weakness and obscuration, according to the Spirit of holiness. His Divine nature, by the resurrection from the dead

Hence the most general statement is that He rose again the third day: 4 the words containing rather an active than a passive meaning 1 John 2:19; 2 John 10:17-18; 3 Romans 1:4; 4 1 Corinthians 15:4 2. Like every other event in the history of the Mediator, the resurrection is ascribed to God the Father

(1.) He was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father: 1 that Father of glory whose glory had its utmost manifestation in the power wherewith it wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead, 2 and, as St. Peter adds, gave Him glory. 3 Hence the glory of God the Father is His power in its exercise; and its result is the Son's resurrection. He to Whom the Incarnate offered the sacrifice of His humiliation bestowed upon Him the reward of His resurrection. When the Redeemer prayed, Glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son also may glorify Thee, 4 He had in view both His death and His rising again from the dead. As the crucified and risen Son He was glorified by the Father 1 Romans 6:4; 2 Ephesians 1:20; 3 1 Peter 1:21; 4 John 17:1

(2.) It was not only, however, the resurrection to glory and reward: it was also the Father's testimony to the perfection of His Divine-human Person as the Son. St. Paul gives the final interpretation of the memorable words of the Psalm: Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee. 1 The manhood of the Incarnate Son was never perfected until the resurrection, which was therefore the consummating period of the Incarnation. The glad tidings 2 announced at the first birth are perfectly declared at the second birth of the Incarnate Son: this day 3 is the One Day of the Lord's incarnate history from the miraculous conception to the rising from the dead, which was the moment of His perfection both as an Incarnate Person and as the Christ 1 Acts 13:33; 2 Luke 2:1-52; 3 Acts 13:32 3. Generally, God absolutely, without distinction of Persons, is said to have raised up the Savior

(1.) This is in harmony with the tenor of Scripture, which speaks everywhere of the processes of the mediatorial history being under the arrangement and ordering of God The resurrection of the Mediator is ascribed to God always when the Messianic subordination is implied or made prominent: Him God raised up the third day, 1 the same who anointed Jesus of Nazareth and was with Him. It may be said generally that the processes of the Redeeming Work of the Three Persons are ascribed to God as the term of Deity representing each 1 Acts 10:38; Acts 10:40

(2.) It is referred to God also when Christ's resurrection is connected with ours; the demonstration of Divine power being made emphatic: the exceeding greatness of His power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of His mighty power, which He wrought in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead. 1 So in that remarkable passage: but if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you. 2 This text, thus read, seems to imply that the Holy Ghost was the Agent in the quickening of Christ, and will be the Agent in ours. But another reading is to be preferred: diá toú enoikoún, on account of the Spirit that dwelleth in us. The Holy Ghost is, strictly speaking, the Agent in spiritual quickening alone 1 Ephesians 1:19; 2 Romans 8:11

(3.) But it must be remembered that here, as everywhere in relation to the Mediatorial Trinity, all actions proceeding ad extra are referred interchangeably to the several Persons of the Trinity. The Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost are one in the sending and raising up and dominion of Him Who is, not the Christ of the Father, but THE CHRIST OF GOD 1 or THE LORD'S CHRIST.2 1 Colossians 2:2; 2 Luke 2:26

II. The resurrection was the seal and glorification of His redeeming work. This may be viewed in regard to the three offices hereafter to be mentioned individually, and to the claims and character of the Messiah generally. Reserving the latter for the next Section, let us mark how the Author and Finisher of the Christian Faith was in the several offices in which He laid the foundations of that Faith justified or approved by His resurrection

1. As the Prophet or the Apostle of revelation He appeals to all His works for the authentication of His teaching generally, and to His resurrection in particular as the crowning work by which He would vindicate His claim to be the Supreme Oracle to mankind. His first emphatic and distinct prediction to the people at large was that concerning the raising of the temple of His body. 1 He again and again foreannounced it, calling attention to the third day; 2 and His resurrection on that day was the seal and confirmation of His prophetic mission. Not only so, however: it was also the entrance of the Prophet on a wider sphere of teaching and influence for the whole world, and the preliminary seal of that new function. It confirmed at once the words already spoken on earth, and the words that should be spoken from heaven. 3 Thus, viewed in relation to the past, it was the ratification of His claim as a prophetic Teacher; viewed in relation to the future, it was the credential of His eternal teaching after its first principles had been given below 1 John 2:21; 2 Matthew 17:23;

3 Hebrews 12:25

2. As the High Priest of the atoning sacrifice our Lord was justified in the resurrection. It declared that His propitiatory offering was accepted as salvation from death, the penalty of sin; and that the Spirit of a new life was obtained for all: both these in one, and as summing up the benefits of the Atonement

(1.) As the Divine-HUMAN Representative of mankind Christ was delivered for our offences; 1 as the Divine-human Representative He was raised again for our justification The strong evidence both of the vicarious character and of the validity of our Lord's sacrifice is given in His resurrection. His release from death declared that He died not for His own sin, and that His atonement was accepted for mankind: Who is he that condemneth ? 2 It is Christ that died, yea rather, that was

raised. The resurrection establishes the atoning character of the death 1 Romans 4:25; 2 Romans 8:34

(2.) His resurrection is the pledge of life—perfect and consummate life in every definition of it—to His people. On it depended the gift of the Spirit of life, the fruit of the Ascension. The Lord rose again as the First begotten from the dead, the First fruits of them that slept. 1 If we died with Him, we shall also live with Him. 2 Because I live, ye shall live also.3 1 1 Corinthians 15:20; 2 2 Timothy 2:11; 3 John 14:19

3. As King our Lord was sealed, anointed, and crowned in the resurrection. In virtue of His Divinity, on the one hand, and, on the other, in anticipation of His atoning work, He was King even in His humiliation, and taught and acted as such. Though He spoke of the kingdom of heaven, and of the kingdom of God, He also spoke of His own kingdom: My kingdom is not of this world, 1 He said to His judge; to His disciples: and I appoint unto you a kingdom, as My Father hath appointed unto Me; that ye may eat and drink at My table in My kingdom. 2 But it was not until His resurrection that He was clothed with mediatorial authority, according to the set time and order of the economy of grace. From the sepulcher He went to the mountain in Galilee, where He clothed Himself with His final authority, and said: All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth.3 1 John 18:36; 2 Luke 22:29-30; 3 Matthew 28:18 EVIDENCES OF THE RESURRECTION The Resurrection was the assurance and infallible proof of the Messiahship of Jesus. It was the Divine demonstration of the truth of the Christian revelation, and itself was demonstrated by sufficient evidences

I. Generally, His resurrection is referred to as the crowning evidence that Jesus is the Christ, and therefore of the Divine authority of His religion

1. The one great argument of the New Testament is that Jesus of Nazareth, rejected and crucified by the Jews, was their Messiah and the world’s Christ, the Son of God and the Son of man. Before His death His Divine credentials of word and work approved Him To them He made His appeal. But He also appealed by anticipation to His own future resurrection. This was His first public pledge laid down in the Temple; and it was repeated when He gave the sign of the prophet Jonas: so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. 1 He had His own resurrection in view when He convicted the Sadducees of not knowing the Scriptures. 2 Hence He further prepared for its evidential force by making the raising of the dead the crowning miracle of His many wonderful works, reserving the greatest for the last 1 Matthew 12:40; 2 Matthew 22:29

2. But for all ages and all times the one demonstration of the Christ and His religion is His rising from the dead. This is the view taken of it by the preachers of the Gospel in the Acts and the teachers of the Christian Faith in the Epistles. They point to it in every discourse as their own great credential, and as confirmed by the Holy Ghost accompanying their words. They preached Jesus and the Resurrection. 1 St. Paul speaks for the whole company when he says that all human hope depended upon the verity of this event. If Christ hath not been raised, then is our preaching vain, your faith also is vain.2 1 Acts 17:18; 2 1 Corinthians 15:14

II. Hence the evidences of the Fact are sufficient. They are of two classes: first, the witness of those to whom our Lord appeared; and, secondly, the witness of the Spirit after His final departure: these, however, are to be combined for ever. The external evidence is not alone; nor is the spiritual evidence of the Christian Faith or demonstration of the Holy Ghost without a basis of facts

which He thus demonstrates to be true

1. No part of our Lord’s history is more minutely recorded than the history of the Forty days, which must chiefly be regarded under this aspect, as a continuous practical proof of the verity of His resurrection to His own chosen witnesses

(1.) These witnesses were selected as such: Him God raised up the third day, and showed Him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with Him after He rose from the dead. 1 The Lord never appeared to the Jews after their rejection of Him: the day of their visitation was over. This also was foretold: I go My way, and ye shall seek Me. 2 Neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead. 3 The witnesses were, in fact, all the members of the Lord’s discipleship: expanding in number from the solitary Mary Magdalene to the Five Hundred. But they were chosen in the sense that special demonstration of the reality and of the nature of His risen body was given to the Apostolic Company 1 Acts 10:40-41; 2 John 8:21; 3 Luke 16:31

(2.) Though the witnesses were chosen, Christ was, according to St. Peter, openly shown of God; and the four Evangelists record the reasons of His prearranged appearance. Five times He showed Himself alive on the day of His resurrection: to Mary Magdalene, 1 to another company of women, 2 to Peter, 3 to two disciples on the way to Emmaus, 4 to the Eleven. 5 To these must be added another Jerusalem appearance for the conviction of St Thomas. Two manifestations took place after long silence in Galilee, to the Seven and to the Five Hundred. Two again in Jerusalem: one to James, the Lord’s brother, and another at the Ascension. 6 These Ten are all the appearances that are recorded: probably all that took place.7

1 Mark 16:1; 2 John 20:1; 3 Matthew 28:1; 4 Luke 24:13; Luke 24:33-34; 5 John 20:19; John 20:24; 6 Matthew 28:16; 7 John 21:1

(3.) The Lord’s occasional visits were accompanied by many infallible proofs; 1 by many signs, tekmeeríois, which could not deceive those who witnessed them. First, He distinguished the day of His resurrection, the third day, by a more abundant exhibition of those signs. The third day was connected with the ancient type of the wave-offering, as the three days and three nights with the prophet Jonah: both meaning, according to Hebrew computation, one whole day and two fragments. On the morrow after the Sabbath the priest shall wave it; 2 the first fruits of harvest were waved before the Lord, and the lamb sacrificed, thus typically uniting the paschal atoning sacrifice of Christ and its Easter acceptance. On the fourteenth Nisan our Lord died, having eaten His Passover on the preceding evening. The paschal Sabbath was the day of His rest in the grave; on the sixteenth He rose; and to give evidence of the honor put on this third day, which was to become the first, He appeared many times. Secondly, He took more than one opportunity of showing the marks, tekmeería, 3 of His hands and His feet, and of exhibiting the verity of His body: even eating and drinking with His disciples. Into the mystery of His double relation—to the present world in a body that might be nourished, and to the spiritual world in a body which suddenly appeared within closed doors—we cannot penetrate. Suffice that the Lord added this special miracle of an occasional resumption of His physical relations in order to demonstrate the reality of His resurrection

He could undergo the Transfiguration at will, and by it closed every interview, and all His appearances, until the ascension. Thirdly, the tokens of the reality of His resurrection were the perfect identity of His human affections. He tarried to convince the doubters by the Old Testament, and by exhibition of Himself; to pardon the transgressors who had forsaken Him, especially Peter, who had added denial to his abandonment, and had a private interview for his personal pardon before the public interview for his official pardon; and to teach the things concerning His kingdom. He thus showed Himself to be the same Jesus 1 Acts 1:3; 2 Leviticus 23:11; 3 Luke 24:39

2. The evidence of our Lord's resurrection contained in the New-Testament records is unimpeachable. Its assailants have always employed one of three methods of resisting it

(1.) They sometimes adopt the transcendent principle of skepticism: the absolute rejection of this supreme miracle, simply because it is miracle. To this all assaults on this fundamental fact of Christianity come at last. The cumulative force of the evidences of every kind is such that it cannot be resisted by those who believe in revelation and the possibility of miraculous intervention. Those who reject the Lord's resurrection on this ground therefore reject with it all Divine revelation; they persistently refuse to consider the evidences of it: not persuaded, incapable of being persuaded, though One rose from the dead.1

1 Luke 16:31

(2.) Certain theories are devised which may account for the universal acceptance of the fact on the part of the disciples. These may be reduced to two: either the first preachers of Christ's resurrection were impostors; or they were enthusiasts, who, having once listened to the visionary tale of a supposed appearance of Christ, propagated the delusion, and recorded it in legendary narratives. But a careful consideration of the character of the Apostles, of the simplicity of their faith in the resurrection of their Lord, of the selfsacrificing labors by which they sealed their testimony even unto death, will teach every candid mind that neither of these can be the solution. And the narratives themselves in their coherence and tranquil consistency irresistibly plead their own cause

(3.) These narratives are sometimes subjected to a process of examination which detects in them inconsistencies. It is true that there are certain differences in the minute details of the day of the resurrection, even as there are differences in the accounts of the Lord's earlier history. But it must be remembered that the witnesses give independent evidence, and that each records something not mentioned by the others. Every Evangelist has his own design: St. Matthew, for instance, keeps the final Mountain and Commission in view; St. Luke, Emmaus and the Ascension; St. John, the more public appearances of the Risen Lord, concerning which he says that he records as the third what was really the eighth. St. Luke's Gospel seems to make the Lord's final departure take place on the evening of the resurrection; but he himself, in the Acts, mentions the forty days. The third Evangelist has two accounts of the Ascension, entirely different in detail but the same in fact; just as he, a careful historian, gives three narratives of Christ's appearance to Saul, in which the minute differences-—such as that the companions of the Convert in one account see without hearing, and in another hear without seeing—only confirm the accuracy of the narrative

3. The supreme Witness of the resurrection of Christ was the Holy Ghost. To His evidence our Lord referred before He departed. The Spirit accompanied the testimony of the Apostles; He has

made the Christian Church the abiding demonstration of the life of its Head; and He gives His assurance in the hearts of all to whose penitent faith He reveals the ascended Savior

(1.) The Apostles preached the Lord's resurrection as witnesses who were sustained by the Spirit's higher testimony: literally, a witness through, and in, and with their preaching And we are His witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, Whom God hath given to them that obey Him. 1 While St. Peter preached the Risen Jesus to Cornelius the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the Word. 2 This was the reason that with great power gave the Apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus; 3 it was because they declared it with the confidence of personal assurance, God also bearing them witness, both by signs and wonders, and by divers powers, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to His own will.4 1 Acts 5:32; 2 Acts 10:44; 3 Acts 4:33; 4 Hebrews 2:4

(2.) The history of the Christian Church, with its institutions, is one continuous and everenlarging demonstration of the unseen life of its Ruler. The Lord's Day, which has been kept as the memorial of the resurrection from its very morning, is itself testimony that there was never a time when the clear faith in that vital Fact was not held. Similarly, the Eucharistic celebration has from the beginning avowed reliance on a Death once suffered and in a Life which has not been continued upon earth. From the day of Pentecost the Church has been opposed by principalities and powers, human and superhuman; but never has the resurrection of its Head and Defender been successfully assailed

(3.) The most universal and best evidence is the influence of the unseen Redeemer by His Spirit in the hearts and lives of believers. The later New Testament dwells on the working in us of the mighty power which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead. 1 The spiritual life of those who accept the Savior is to themselves a ground of assurance that needs nothing to be added. They receive the records because they are bound up with the Scriptures of truth; they believe the Event recorded because it took place in harmony with ancient prediction, according to the Lord's own word, and in consistency with His own Divine power. They know that no argument was brought against the fact by those who were most interested in denying it at the beginning; and that no argument has been brought since that has any force. But their infallible evidence is the life of their own souls 1 Ephesians 1:19-20 THE ASCENSION AND SESSION The Ascension of our Lord is the historical term and end of His Exaltation; and, as such, may be viewed in its preliminaries, recorded by all the Evangelists; as an actual event recorded by St. Luke mainly; and in its sequel including the entire Apostolical testimony to His Session and Intercession

I. The narrative of the Forty Days describes, not only the sequel of the resurrection, but also the preparation for the ascension. The seven weeks of interval corresponded to the seven weeks numbered from the wave-offering, the type of CHRIST THE FIRST-FRUITS. 1 But nothing in Old-Testament symbol or type points to the fortieth day as that of the Saviour's going up. That day was chosen by our Lord: but not arbitrarily. In His love to His disciples and in His wise provision for the future He gave to them the larger part of this time. It may be supposed that His main purpose was to wean them from their dependence on His personal and visible presence. Hence the gradually diminishing appearances. Hence that one preliminary note of the ascension: Touch Me not, for I am not yet ascended! 2 This explains the blended remembrances of the past and anticipations of the future: of which the last chapter of St. John is an impressive example. Of any

preparation of His body for the day of His glorifying there is no hint. It was simply the set hour; but the hour set by Himself: no change passed upon Him during the interval The resurrection was the final removal from the conditions of human life; and, so far as concerned Himself, there was no reason to keep Him on earth. His tarrying so long in a midway condition was due to His tender concern for His disciples. And the result was that when He finally departed they were fully prepared for the new economy of His spiritual manifestation; they surrendered Him resignedly to the heavens which must receive Him; 3 and they returned to Jerusalem with great joy.4 1 1 Corinthians 15:23; 2 John 20:17; 3 Acts 3:21; 4 Luke 24:52

II. The history of the Event is recorded only by St. Luke. His account in the Gospel describes it rather as the end of the Lord's life on earth, in the Acts with reference rather to His mediatorial work in heaven and final return to finish redemption 1. The Ascension was the end of the Saviour's earthly course

(1.) Until that day Jesus went in and out among us; 1 and His life had been spent amidst unglorified human conditions. The forty days were also days of His flesh, 2 for all His manifestations were in many respects like those of former times: the spiritual vanishings were anticipations of the ascension, and are not alluded to save as marking the appearances themselves 1 Acts 1:21; 2 Hebrews 5:7

(2.) Hence the clear historical narrative which runs on with a continuous detail of what Jesus began both to do and to teach until the day in which He was received up. 1 The Lord led them out as far as to Bethany. 2 He went before them as He was wont to do, but now for the last time. He led them out designedly that they might be witnesses. Reported from them and was carried up into heaven; or, as elsewhere, far above all heavens, 3 far above the gradational heavens to which St. Paul himself, and other saints, had been rapt

It was not, as before, a disappearance into Hades—between which and the upper world the Forty Days alternated—but a local withdrawal into what is called the Presence of God, 4 concerning which we cannot and we need not form any conception. During His life He spoke of His ascent as belonging to His incarnation: the Son of Man was in heaven, and had ascended up to heaven, 5 in virtue of the hypostatic union. But in this final going up the heaven must receive 6 Him: words which must retain their full significance, though they are quite consistent with His receiving the heavens 1 Acts 1:1-2; 2 Luke 24:50-51; 3 Ephesians 4:10; 4 Hebrews 9:24; 5 John 3:13; 6 Acts 3:21

(3.) The Apostles were witnesses of this event. The Resurrection neither they nor any mortal witnessed; but the Forty Days were a continuous evidence to them that their Lord had risen. The entire community of believers was not summoned to Bethany: for, though it was necessary that the resurrection should be attested by all, the ascension had not the same evidential character. In this respect it was only the natural conclusion, as it were, of the resurrection itself; and is never referred to in the Epistles save in its theological, experimental, and practical bearings. The Apostles had been with their Master in His temptations, and they were permitted to behold the honor and glory which He received in His ascension. Only three of them witnessed the transfiguration-earnest, the same, namely, who witnessed the agony of the garden; but all are admitted to the second holy mount: only, however, the Apostolic company, for there is selection still. Their evidence is sufficient to assure us of the reward conferred on the human nature of our

Lord, and of the fact of His entrance into the invisible world

2. As the beginning of a new life the ascension was the passing into a new sphere of mediatorial action, the taking possession of the Presence of God for His people, in a departure from earth which preceded a return from heaven or His appearing the second time.1 1 Hebrews 9:24; Hebrews 9:28

(1.) With the Lord's ascension is always connected the priestly office of intercession wherein as the High Priest He pleads His propitiation for the sins of the whole world, 1 and as His people's Surety pleads especially for them. We have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous; Who is passed into the heavens, 2 even as His type entereth into the holy place every year. 3 And the government of the Church is in His hands, as seated on the mediatorial throne: to exercise the dominion He went up, even as He came down to obtain it through death. Hence it is said to be a dignity with His right hand 4 conferred on the Son by the Father, and to be the reward of His humiliation unto death. In this sense heaven is the centre of the universe, from which the heavens, the earth, and things under the earth are surveyed and governed by the Incarnate Lord. But the further consideration of this subject belongs to the doctrine of the Offices of Christ 1 1 John 2:1-2; 2 Hebrews 4:14; 3 Hebrews 9:25; 4 Acts 5:31

(2.) The account of the Acts connects the departure of our Lord with His return: hence the prophetic Mount called Olivet,1 the new angelic announcement which in every word respects the future and not the past, and the emphasis laid upon the first Promise of the perfected Christ: This same Jesus, Which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven.2 The Second Coming is predicted as soon as the first is past; this being the link of continuity between the old covenant and the new: in both there is a great expectation of the Savior. Meanwhile, the theological bearing of the Ascension of our Lord is most affectingly taught in connection with the doctrine of His people's union with Him. In virtue of this, believers are blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ; 3 and seek the things that are above, where Christ is, seated on the right hand of God.4 And, according to the last words of the New Testament, their one deep longing is to see Him again: Even so, come, Lord Jesus! 5 1 Acts 1:12; Zechariah 14:4; 2 Acts 1:11; 3 Ephesians 1:3; 4 Colossians 3:1; 5 Revelation 22:20

III. The sequel of the Ascension is the Session at the right hand of God in heaven; with its attestation on earth, the Pentecostal descent of the Holy Spirit, the Promise of the New Covenant

1. The Session was the subject of our Saviour's prophecy, equally with the events that preceded it. His first reference to it was indirect: He saith unto them, How then doth David in Spirit call Him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit Thou on My right hand, till I make Thine enemies Thy footstool?1 Afterwards, in His own day of judgment, when He was adjured by the high priest and confessed Himself the Son of God, He varied the phrase: Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power. 2 This emphatic twofold allusion of Christ is echoed throughout the New Testament, and rules all that follows 1 Matthew 22:43-44; 2 Matthew 26:64

(1.) The Apostle Peter speaks of Him as raised by the right hand of God 1 to sit on the right hand of God. 2 And he constantly refers to the Session, sometimes with and sometimes without the term, to express the mediatorial authority of Christ as an administration of the power of God: to shed forth the influences of that Holy Ghost Who represents upon earth the Lord's administration

in heaven. But St. Paul is the elect expositor of this authority, and he sums up the entire doctrine in his Ephesian Epistle He raised Him from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be the Head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fullness of Him that fillet all in all. 3 1 Acts 2:33; 2 1 Peter 3:22; 3 Ephesians 1:20-22

(2.) Hence the Ascension is described as the beginning of a supreme authority which is to end when He hath put all enemies under His feet. 1 Until then our Lord's Session is passive also, as in the attitude of expectation: But He, when He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till His enemies be made His footstool. 2 But Stephen, for his assurance in death, saw the Son of Man STANDING on the right hand of God.3 1 1 Corinthians 15:25; 2 Hebrews 10:12-13; 3 Acts 7:56

(3.) But, lastly, this delegated and terminable authority is based upon an eternal prerogative of Session: He who sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high was THE SON, Whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by Whom also He made the worlds; before His incarnation being the effulgence of His glory, and the express image of His person, and upholding all things by the word of His power. 1 Nor could He have sat on the right hand of God, in universal supremacy, had He not in His eternal dignity been in the Bosom of the Father.2 1 Hebrews 1:2-3; 2 John 1:18

2. The Pentecostal gift of the Holy Ghost was at once the immediate proof of the verity of the ascension, and demonstration of the authority to which it led. The prediction of the Psalmist, Thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them, 1 was interpreted both by our Lord and by St. Paul of the supreme Gift of the Spirit. I will send Him unto you 2 was the promise before the Saviour's departure; it was confirmed after His resurrection; and it was fulfilled on the Day of Pentecost once for all and for ever 1 Psalms 68:18; 2 John 16:7

(1.) For this there were Ten days of preparation. Whether or not the disciples connected the promised Gift with the Fiftieth day, the end of the seven weeks, we cannot tell: probably they did. The indefinite not many days hence 1 might suggest to the presentiment of some among them what others were not prepared to infer. Evidently their Master's purpose was to make this interval a period of discipline: without His personal presence in the flesh, and without His spiritual manifestation by the Holy Ghost, they were reduced for a season to a midway condition of which there is no parallel. But these days were days of prayer; of personal and united preparation for the most glorious revelation heaven had ever sent down to earth. The circle of the Apostolic company was made complete by the choice of St. Matthias; and this by lot, as in an intermediate dispensation between the Lord's departure and the coming of the Spirit. Thus the organic body prepared for the Spirit by the Lord Himself was made whole after the great breach that had been made in it. And the individual believers were prepared for the high Gift by meditation upon their own powerlessness and need, and by fervent prayer for its bestowment. Hence the history of the Eve of Pentecost is narrated in the Acts with careful precision as the record of the final preparations for this consummate fullness of time, the descent of the Holy Ghost

1 Acts 1:5

(2.) The Gift itself was the demonstration of the Session of Christ at the right hand of God. Having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, He hath shed forth this, which ye, now see and hear. 1 St. Paul speaks of the ascension gifts unto men with special reference to the dispensation of the ministry, unto the edifying of the body of Christ, 2 which began with the day of Pentecost. But the great prophecy in the Psalm, that the Lord God might dwell among them, 3 had its plenary fulfillment when the Holy Ghost came down as the Shekinah, the symbol of God manifest in the flesh, resting upon the Church and abiding within it as the indwelling presence of the Holy Trinity. Thus the glory within the veil, and the candlestick outside, symbols of the Son and the Spirit, were blended when the veil was removed, into one and the same FULNESS OF GOD.4 1 Acts 2:33; 2 Ephesians 4:8; Ephesians 4:12; 3 Psalms 68:18; 4 Ephesians 3:19 SCRIPTURAL DEVELOPMENTOF THE TWO ESTATES The Two Estates of the Redeemer are exhibited throughout the Scriptures with the same precision and uniformity as that which we have marked in the doctrine of the Two Natures in the Incarnate Lord. But we need not trace so carefully the process of Biblical teaching on this subject, as it has been to a great extent anticipated in the development of the doctrine of Christ's Person

I. In the Old Testament the history of the future Minister of redemption is foreshadowed as a career leading through deep humiliation to glory; the Messiah being a mediatorial Person, whose attributes are Divine and human, but Who always occupies a subordinate position in carrying out the Divine counsel. The first distant intimation of this is the phrase Angel of Jehovah, where Jehovah is the Agent of Jehovah. In due time the term Messiah, or The Anointed, prophetically designated the same Angel as incarnate: the future Revealer of the Divine will, Propitiation for human sin, and Ruler of a saved and ransomed people. But this Messiah is described as consecrated for God by God, first to a state of the deepest depression and then to a state of the highest majesty In Isaiah's prophecy, which gave our Lord His own term Minister, the coming of the Incarnate is predicted as that of a Servant. All the Psalms and the Prophets, however, agree in ascribing to the Redeemer a subordination to God which is made mysteriously consistent with Divine titles and honors. In Him the Alpha and Omega meet

II. Our Lord never defines the secret of His incarnate Person; never speaks of His two natures as united in one; nor does He once propose the mystery of His examination and its results to the acceptance of His disciples. He reveals it distinctly but does not distinctly explain it, thus tacitly rebuking beforehand the future presumption of speculative theology. We must consider only therefore the kind of testimony which He gives as to the two Estates respectively 1. In many ways He declares His subordination in His humbled state; but always speaks of it as a voluntary submission

(1.) He terms Himself the Son of Man rather than the Son of God, though not refusing the latter name. He speaks of Himself as come not to be ministered unto, but to minister; 1 of His doctrine as what My Father hath taught Me, and the things which I have heard of Him: 2 of His mediatorial work as a commission or commandment received of My Father, 3 for the strength to accomplish which He prayed, while for its gradual disclosure, or the hour of each crisis, He waited: Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father. 4 He spoke of God as apart from Himself: His God as well as ours. He said, My Father is greater than I, 5 when speaking of His going to Him through the way of humble suffering. Not so much in individual passages, as in the uniform tone of His self-disclosure, we mark the

Redeemer's strict subordination to the Father as the God and Head of the redeeming economy 1 Matthew 20:28; 2 John 8:26; John 8:28; 3 John 10:18; 4 Mark 13:32; 5 John 14:28

(2.) That the incarnate Jesus in His humbled estate voluntarily made Himself subject, while retaining the eternal dignity of His Divinity, is obvious from these assertions of His oneness with the Father to which reference has already been made, from His demand of honor equal to that paid to the Father, and especially from His anticipation of a return of the glory which He surrendered in His incarnation. There are some passages in which the voluntary subordination and the coequal dignity are combined in a manner that ought not to be misunderstood. For as the Father hath life in Himself, even so gave He to the Son also to have life in Himself. 1 I came forth and am come from God; neither came I of Myself, but He sent Me. 2 The profoundest word, however, is not in St. John, but in St Matthew: All things are delivered unto Me of My Father; and no one knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither doth any know the Father save theSong of Solomon 3:1-11 1 John 5:26; 2 John 8:42; 3 Matthew 11:27

(3.) Hence we are constrained to interpret our Lord's testimony to His exinanition in a sense that shall make it consistent with His consciousness of equality with the Father This is the great difficulty of the subject; but it is a Scriptural difficulty, committed to humble faith; and this doctrine of a relative and only mediatorial inferiority is much more consonant with the Christian idea of God than the theories of a contracted or depotentiated Divinity which are invented in its stead

2. The Saviour's testimonies to His state of dignity are in word before His ascension, in word and manifestation afterwards

(1.) It is important to consider in what way our Lord was wont to look forward to His future dignity. Here we mark the same twofold strain that we find throughout the subject On the one hand, He speaks of His exaltation as simply the avowal to the universe of His true character and dignity. No man hath ascended into heaven, but He that descended out of heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven: 1 the Savior, foreseeing His ascension, speaks of it as adding nothing to His real dignity, because He is never out of heaven. Human nature in contact with Him is already exalted. He who heard these words had just before heard the Lord say: Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. 2 But when the Lord at the close prayed for His coming glorification we understand that Jesus, for the joy that was set before Him, endured the cross, 3 anticipating His reward 1 John 3:13; 2 John 2:19; 3 Hebrews 12:2

(2.) After His ascension the Redeemer most expressly teaches us the continuance of a mediatorial subjection in harmony with the essential Divinity of His Divine-human Person. As to the fact of the abiding subordination, He speaks of Himself as the Minister of redemption precisely in the same terms as while on earth. There is literally no difference. He bids His servants speak of Him as the Prince and the Savior Whom God exalted with His right hand, 1 as the Son or the Servant sent to bless. 2 There is no more glorious manifestation of Christ than that to Saul in his conversion, and there we hear our Lord saying that his office should be to turn men from the power of Satan unto God . .by faith that is in Me. 3 So in the Epistle to the Church of Philadelphia He speaks of the temple of My God and the name of My God: 4 reminding us of the words before the ascension, My Father and your Father, My God and your God. 5 But that this continuing ministry is consistent with His supreme Divinity, we have the Apocalyptic testimony When St. John was in Patmos, and in the Spirit, he heard the voice of the Redeemer, saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning

and the End: 6 than these words none more expressly declare in Scripture the necessary, absolute being of God. That the Risen Savior spoke of Himself is evident from what follows the first human manifestation: Fear not; I am the First and the Last: I am He that liveth! 7 Deep meditation on these and all other such sayings of our Lord must constrain us to understand His secret: the FELLOW of God made the SERVANT of redemption 1 Acts 5:31; 2 Acts 3:26; 3 Acts 26:18; 4 Revelation 3:12; 5 John 20:17; 6 Revelation 22:13; 7 Revelation 1:17-18

III. The Two Estates occupy a prominent place in the Apostolical theology. It will be expedient to refer only to a few salient points: the subordination generally; its continuance until the last day; its continuance for ever

1. The subordination of our Lord is in one sense limited to the days of His flesh, and ends with His exaltation at the ascension. One passage is entirely dedicated to this subject: that in the Epistle to the Philippians which makes the voluntary condescension of Christ the example of Christian humility. The Eternal Son, retaining His equality with God, and still being in the form of God, yet made Himself of no reputation, 1 or emptied Himself. It is too often forgotten that the subjection of Christ is here altogether voluntary; that it is matter of self-imputation rather than of an impossible reality. As in the form of God, Christ was still the possessor of Divine attributes, but He did not use or manifest them

He thought it not robbery to be equal with God: He did not, as to His human nature, think fit to arrogate the display of His equality with God. But it was in the form of a servant that He humbled Himself; while His examination was that of the God-man, in respect, however, to His Divinity as making the manhood its organ

1 Php 2:2-8

2. The exalted state is, further, not described as the resumption of our Lord's pretemporal glory apart from His incarnate subjection. Though the fullness of the Godhead 1 is in Him, it is in Him bodily, 2 and as flowing from the pleasure of the Father: the eternal generation was not an act of the Divine will, but in the necessity of the Divine essence; but it pleased the Father that in Him should all fullness dwell after the ascension. Hence in the Corinthian Epistles we have some distinct exhibitions of the subordination. The Head of Christ is God: 3 this is perhaps the most striking expression of the fact that even in heaven the Incarnate is mediatorially subject. And Christ is God's 4 declares the same truth. But it is the current doctrine of the Epistles; and finds its reason as well as its expression in the sequel of the passage above quoted: therefore God also hath highly exalted Him! 5 1 Colossians 2:9; 2 Colossians 1:19; 3 1 Corinthians 11:3; 4 1 Corinthians 3:23; 5 Php 2:9

3. There is a sense, however, in which the subordination is represented as abiding eternally. Only one passage expressly refers to this; but it is one which is exceedingly explicit, and gives so much prominence to the subject that we must not pass it by as belonging to the hidden and reserved mysteries of the Christian faith. Then shall the Son also Himself be subjected to Him that put all things under Him: autós ho Huiós hupotageésetai. 1 Here, theologically at least, we might take a middle signification: the Son shall subject Himself. It is indeed as if, at the close of the redeeming economy, He reaffirms His original assumption of our nature. He will not fold it or lay it aside as a vesture. Remaining in the unity of the Father and the Holy Ghost—God shall be All in all—He will

end the whole history and mystery of redemption by ratifying His incarnation for ever 1 1 Corinthians 15:28

4. Before leaving the Scriptural view of this subject we should observe that the sacred writers give no formula to express the mediatorial relation of the Son incarnate to the Father and to the Holy Trinity. All that is meant by subordination is asserted, but the word is not used; nor is any synonym employed until the subjection of the last day is referred to. This is a remarkable circumstance and points to a striking theological paradox. It might seem that the following was the order of the Lord's historical process: The Logos in the Trinity, the humiliation of the incarnate state, the elevation to supreme dignity after the resurrection, the abdication at the close of all mediatorial authority as such, and the voluntary continuance of the Son as incarnate in a subordination to the Eternal Trinity that does not impair the dignity of the Son as God in the unity of the Father and of the Holy Ghost. The union of man with His Creator is thus made perfect: not by Pantheistic absorption into the Godhead, but by union with God in the Son. The Lamb is in the midst of the throne; 1 and He is the Head of the Church, the Savior of the Body, 2 for ever 1 Revelation 7:17; 2 Ephesians 5:23 ECCLESIASTICAL DEVELOPMENT The earlier developments of historical Christology were limited to the relation of the two natures in the one Person of the Christ Subsequent controversies had reference rather to the nature of the subordinate estate into which the Redeemer descended. At the Reformation the characteristics of the Divine-human humiliation on the one hand, and on the other its reversal in the ascended dignity, were profoundly studied and became the ground of many divisions. A few general remarks will be enough to indicate the direction which theological study here takes: first, in mediaeval theology; then in the theories of Lutheranism; and, lastly, in some miscellaneous tendencies of modern thought

I. After the settlement of the Four Ecumenical Councils the Christological discussions reappeared in controversies referring rather to the degree in which the Divine Person partook of the humiliation of the human nature. Four speculative tendencies may, without violence, be brought into relation with each other

1. First the Monophysite and Monothelite errors made our Lord's humbled estate a real renunciation of both His natures, without seeming to do so. These were simply the reflex of the Eutychian heresy, which has never vanished from theology

(1.) The Monophysite dogma has been called Theopaschitism, because its tendency was to assign one nature as well as one Person to Christ, Who therefore as a composite Godman was crucified: the emphasis of course resting on the Divine nature which absorbed the human, the passion was exaggerated into a suffering of God Hence the name. This error was held in a great variety of forms; in its one general principle it was the link of transition between pure Eutychianism, which absorbed the man in the God, and the philosophical Eutychianism of modern Lutheran theories. Monophysites are supposed to linger only among the Eastern sects: in reality the divines of the Depotentiation school are their representatives

(2.) The Monothelite heresy was the same with a difference: the former error just mentioned had reference to the human nature of Christ generally; this latter to His single will only. Now if there was in Christ only one will, there could be only one nature; for the will cannot be divided. Hence the humanity was abolished in this dogma, and the humiliation of the Son of God was His sinking to such a point as to say NOT AS I WILL The true doctrine taught indeed ONE THEANDRIC,

OPERATION, but as the result of two wills, the human being of necessity submissive to the Divine or necessarily one with it in act

2. The heresy sometimes called Adoptianism was taught by two Spanish divines in the eighth century, and was condemned at the Synod of Frankfurt, A.D. 794. It was really a revival of Nestorianism; as it kept apart the Divine and the human son-ship of our Lord, making the human nature partaker of the Divine Sonship only by an act of heavenly and gracious adoption. Thus the humbled estate of the God-man was merely the expression of His alliance with a human person of consummate and more than human excellence

Alcuin and other opponents of this view laid great stress on the fact that the humiliation of Christ was His union with our nature, not with a human individual: " In absumtione carnis a Deo, persona perit hominis, non natura." 3. The term Nihilianism is suggested by a controversy once vigorous, but of little importance save as the expression of an erroneous protest against a still greater error. It took up the word that defeated the error just mentioned—that is, the IMPERSONALITY of our Lord's human nature—and defended the position that the Second Person underwent no change whatever through the assumption of flesh. The notion was condemned by the Lateran Council of A.D. 1215, as tending to reduce the Incarnation to a nullity. It was the very opposite of Theopaschitism before, and of the Depotentiation theory that followed, the Reformation: these errors both being based on the assumption that God in one of the Divine Persons is capable of being reduced to such a point as to combine with a finite personality as its power and energy. But error cannot cast out error; and this theory perverted the true dogma of the impersonality of the human nature of our Lord by excluding the reality of a human presentation of His Divine human Person. It went far towards abolishing the Humbled Estate, and leaving only a Docetic Christianity

4. Very much more interesting was the mediaeval discussion as to whether the suffering of the God-man was essentially necessary, or whether His union with human nature was attended with humiliation only on account of sin. While the question is confined to these limits the answer is plain enough: we know of no manhood as the object of the Redeemer's condescension apart from sin, and of no Mediator who was not made sin for us. But the question does not rest there

5. This beautiful speculation involves another topic of very great importance. The question is not simply whether or not human sin rendered necessary the Incarnation, but whether man was not really the created expression of God's eternal idea in His Son. The Infinite and the finite were one in Him. The universal Spirit in God found its incarnate embodiment, realized itself, in humanity as conceived in the historical Jesus. The Pantheistic Christology of Duns Scotus in the early middle ages laid the foundation for modern German transcendental philosophy, which, whether in Kant or Hegel, is intimately bound up with the necessary evolving of the Trinity through Christ. But from these speculations we must turn away II. At the Reformation, the Lutheran and the Reformed dogmas concerning our Lord's Two Estates widely disparted

1. The Lutheran was based upon the principle of a COMMUNIO NATURARUM, or COMMUNICATIO IDIOMATUM: the latter implying that the attributes of the Divinity were imparted to the manhood in the unity of the Person; the former implying further that the one nature is interpenetrated by the other, that what one nature is and does the other is and does. The " Natura humana est in Christo capax Divinae." The Reformed doctrine denied this: "Finitum non est capax Infiniti." It asserted that the humanity of Christ never was nor ever could be possessed of Divine

attributes. It may be well to consider more at large the Lutheran dogmatics on this subject. It divides the Communicatio Idiomatum, or interchange of attributes, into three branches. (1.) The GENUS IDIOMATICUM: this signifies the use of predicates taken from either nature and applied to the whole Person. (2.) The GENUS AUCHEMATICUM SEU MAJESTATIGUM: this signifies the ascription of Divine attributes to the human nature, in the POSSESSION from the conception, in the full USE from the ascension. (3.) The GENUS APOTELESMATICUM: this signifies the ascription of mediatorial acts to the One Agent. It is obvious that the second of these contains the peculiarity of Lutheran doctrine. The Reformed theologians, and the great body of the Christian Church, have always denied the communication of omnipresence, omniscience, and omnipotence in any sense to the human nature of our Lord

2. The application of the theory to the Two Estates may be traced in two opposite directions: first, in regard to the deification of the human nature generally in the ascension, and particularly the ubiquity of that nature in the Eucharist; secondly, in regard to the more modern theories of retraction or depotentiation of Divinity in the Incarnate Man

(1.) In the Lutheran theology the ascension of Christ is regarded as the assumption of His human nature into the full dignity and use of all Divine perfections. During His humiliation He possessed the attributes of omnipresence, omniscience and omnipotence, but voluntarily declined to exhibit them. After the exaltation there was in Him the fullness of the Godhead bodily. 1 His body became not merely the organ of these attributes, but itself possessed them. He entered not into the local heaven, but into the immensity of God. The heavens did not receive Him, but He received the heavens: so are the words hón deí mén déxasthai áchri 2 translated by the advocates of this view 1 Colossians 2:9; 2 Acts 3:21

(2.) Hence the soul and body of Christ have the ubiquity of the Godhead. Not, however, that the actual flesh of the Redeemer can be literally extended to infinity; but that the hypostatic union gives the Divine power and knowledge to the Glorified Man, and therefore the omnipresence also. The application of this doctrine to the Saviour’s offices will be hereafter seen. Suffice here to observe that it is made to explain the anomaly in the prophetic office that the Divine-human Revealer was ignorant of some things while on earth: in Him now are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. The Glorified King now sways the destinies of the universe as God-man: while on earth He had, no such authority save in the unity of the Triune God. As Priest the Redeemer gives the virtue of omnipresence now to the sacrifice He offered for sin, dispensing to the communicants at the Eucharist His glorified body and blood at every altar. The theology of Lutheranism generally attaches much importance to the physical aspect of redemption

It seems to regard corporeal embodiment as " the end of all God’s ways:" to use the favorite language of some of its modern exponents

(3.) In the beginning of the seventeenth century a controversy on this subject sprang up in Lutheranism. One party maintained that the humiliation of Christ was the hiding of Divine attributes which in His human estate He possessed: this idea of krypsis, or concealment, gave them their name of Kryptists. Another party affirmed that there was an actual kenosis, or emptying Himself, of the Divine attributes which belonged to the human nature in virtue of the hypostatical union: hence they were Kenotists. The former view invested Jesus as man with omnipresence, omniscience and omnipotence from the moment of the Conception; but this possession was veiled during the

earthly life, and avowed only after the Ascension. The latter regarded Him as having the ktoosis or possession of these attributes from His birth, but as utterly renouncing their chresis or use until He was glorified. The former view, held by the Tubingen theologians, made the ascension the first display of Christ's Divine attributes in humanity; the latter view, held by the Giessen theologians, made it the first, resumption of them. The controversy was one of infinite subtlety, but concerned only the Lutheran theologians: they alone asserted a communication of Divine attributes to the manhood, and they alone were involved in the embarrassments resulting. The general bearing of the question is well seen in the following words of Gerhard: —"Not a part to a part, but the entire Logos was united to the entire flesh, and the entire flesh was united to the entire Logos; therefore, on account of the hypostatic union and intercommunion of the two natures, the Logos is so present to the flesh and the flesh so present to the Logos that neither is the Logos EXTRA CARNEM, nor is the flesh EXTRA LOGON; but wherever the Logos is, there it has the flesh most present, as having been assumed into the unity of the person." The controversy led to no definite results: indeed, to us who look at the question from the outside, there is but little difference between them

(4.) During the present century the condescension of the Son of God in the Incarnation has been profoundly studied by German and French divines under the influence of a certain Eutychianism that has never ceased to cling to Lutheran Christology, but modified by the transcendental philosophy which sees in Christ the developing body of the Spirit of the Godhead coming to perfect personality in the Holy Ghost. The various opinions to which the names of individual men are attached need not be discussed at length; that would be to exaggerate their importance. It will be enough to mention the one element common to them all: namely, that of a literal merging of the Divinity of the Son into the finite Spirit of the Man Christ Jesus. The general idea takes many forms: sometimes simply Pantheistic, the Eternal Spirit thinking itself as a Person in Christ; sometimes purely Eutychian, God the Son contracted into humanity, and both growing together to perfection; sometimes Apollinarian, the Potency of the Son working dynamically in the psychical soul and flesh of Jesus. But all these hypotheses have been shown by anticipation to be incapable of resisting the simple argument of the essential Immutability of the Divine nature

III, Many modern theories have been revived from antiquity or invented afresh which have striven to break the fall of the Divine into the human, the chief of these being the interposition of a human pre-existent soul of Christ

1. The one fundamental principle in these sporadic speculations —they have never been formulated in any Confessions—is that the pure humanity of our Lord was as independent of the race of man as that of Adam was when he came from the Hand and Breath of his Maker. Denying, with the Scripture, that Jesus owed anything to a human father, they deny, without or in opposition to Scripture, that He derived anything from a human mother. The Virgin was no more than the instrument or channel through which a Divine humanity, existing before the foundation of the world or from eternity, was introduced by the Holy Ghost into human history. The passages relied upon for the maintenance of this notion are such as that in which our Lord says, I came down from heaven,1 and the Second Man is [the Lord] from heaven, 2 which, with some like them, are made to signify that the human nature as well as the Divine was pre-existent in eternity 1 John 6:38; 2 1 Corinthians 15:47

2. Modern Mysticism has furnished in Behmen, Poiret, Barclay, AEtinger, Goschel, Petersen, and others, the most attractive forms of this theory. In them the pure ideal humanity of Jesus—which it is hard however to conceive as purely ideal— was one with the Word from eternity, as it were in a pretemporal incarnation. After the fashion of that humanity man was created: and the incarnate Jesus of history literally came unto His own. 1 AEtinger, one of the most unexceptionable of Mystics, says: " Because Wisdom, before the Incarnation, was the visible Image of the invisible God, therefore the Son, in comparison with the Being of all beings, is something relatively incorporeal, although He too is a pure spirit. The heavenly humanity which He had as the Lord from heaven was invisibly present even with the Israelites. They drank out of the rock." But in all these speculations the Incarnation is antedated; or, rather, it is not the Son of God Who becomes flesh but the Son of God already in the heavenly nature of mankind

1 John 1:11

3. Swedenborgianism, in its theological system, has on this subject as on every other, a peculiar revelation. Swedenborg asserted the unity of God, and strove to reconcile with that the Deity of Christ. His theory established a kind of hypostatic union between the Father and the Son in the One Christ, the only God in the universe. The Incarnation he viewed in an Apollinarian way: the eternal God, eternally God-man, manifested Himself in the animal soul and psychical body derived from the Virgin; but the material body was finally absorbed and glorified. This is literally a composite of nearly all the heresies of antiquity. But its peculiarity as to the person of Christ is that it gives Him, like all other men, both a material body and a spiritual, the former corresponding with the world of sense, the latter with the spiritual world which He never left. The Christ of this system is the one eternal Jehovah, God and Man in one

4. Others, of whom Isaac Watts may be regarded as the representative, have held similar views as to the pre-existent humanity of Christ. Their starting point is the same as the Lutheran, that the human spirit is capable of expansion to infinity. Now the pre-existent soul of Christ was, in their view, created and personally united with the Logos: here Orthodoxy and Arianism unite. This already incarnate Logos became incarnate on earth by assuming the animal life of a natural body: here Apollinarianism, as so often elsewhere, steps in. Accordingly, all the humiliation of our Lord consisted in this transcendent human spirit being bereft of its knowledge and passing through all stages of exinanition until the ascension restored it to its perfection. But in this case the Man Christ Jesus is not strictly one of us. There is an enormous addition made to His Person; but there is no relief afforded to the difficulties of His humiliation THE THREE OFFICES OF THE CHRIST

Jesus is, in virtue of His incarnation, the Anointed Mediator between God and man. To the offices of His mediatorship His incarnate Person was specifically anointed at His baptism, and thus He became the perfected Christ of God. His work was the fulfillment and consummation of the ancient prophetical, priestly and regal functions to which the typical servants of God under the old economy were anointed. These offices He began to discharge on earth, and continues to discharge in heaven. While considering them as distinct, it is important to remember that they are one in the mediatorial work; and that the integrity of evangelical truth depends upon the faithfulness with which we give to each its due tribute in the unity of the two others The division of the mediatorial work into Three Offices is based, as will be seen, on the Scriptures, both of the Old and of the New Testament, but it is not formally stated in them. It was current in later Judaism; is

distinctly to be traced in the early Fathers, especially Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Augustine; and in the Middle Ages was elaborated by Thomas Aquinas. It was introduced into their theology both by Luther and Calvin, and, though contended against by some writers who object to the too systematic distinction of the several offices, it has become current in modern theology. There are many reasons why it is inexpedient to make the Three Offices the basis of an analysis of the mediatorial work. But their consideration is most appropriate in the present review of the process of historical redemption THE CHRIST OF PROPHECY The Redeemer of mankind, whose advent in the fullness of time is the supreme verbal and typical prophecy of the Old Testament, was marked out as THE LORD'S ANOINTED or THE CHRIST. This appellation was not at first given to Him directly, but indirectly as He was represented by those who in the Theocracy were anointed to their office. In some passages however the future Savior is predicted by this name; and when He came into the world He was the fulfillment of a general expectation of the Messiah as hereafter to come in one or all of these three offices I. Anointing was from early times a symbol of consecration to God: to the Divine possession and to the Divine service

1. Generally, it signified human dedication and Divine acceptance. So, in the first recorded instance of its use, Jacob took the stone that he had put for his pillows, and set it up for a pillar, and poured oil upon the top of it, 1 because it was revealed to him, the Lord is in this place. More particularly it was the symbol of light and peace and joy: of light for prophetical illumination, of peace for priestly atonement, of joy for regal government as the presence of God with His people 1 Genesis 28:18; Genesis 28:16

2. This anointing oil was the emblem of the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of consecration. As blood was the expiatory symbol, water that of purification, and light of God's accepting presence, so oil was the symbol of sanctification generally as mystically combining all these. This symbol in its most perfect form, the holy anointing oil, 1 was a peculiar confection, like everything pertaining to the sanctuary after a Divine pattern, and never to be used save in connection with Divine uses, for the priesthood and the sanctuary; it was not to be privately prepared, nor to be poured upon man's flesh or the stranger. It is holy, and it shall be holy unto you. Thus the precious ointment, the ointment of the apothecary, was the elect typical emblem of the Holy Ghost in His special relation to the unction of Christ, and in His general relation to that of the saints who share the sacred unction 1 Exodus 30:22-33

II. Anointing oil was used for the consecration of the priesthood and of the prophets and rulers; especially of the high priest and the kings in the ancient economy

1. The priests were anointed, as also the furniture of the sacrificial service: all things were both sprinkled with blood and anointed with oil. And thou shalt anoint Aaron and his sons, and consecrate them. 1 And Moses took of the anointing oil, and of the blood which was upon the altar, and sprinkled it upon Aaron, and upon his garments, and upon his sons, and upon his sons' garments with him; and sanctified Aaron. 2 The anointing oil was therefore as essential and as pervasive as the blood, its correlative symbol: the expiatory atonement and the consecration of the Holy Ghost being co-ordinate. After the first institution the priest that is anointed 3 signified the High Priest: it is to be supposed that the successors in the ordinary priesthood were not consecrated by this symbol. The prophets were set apart in the same way. Moses, the head of the prophetic order, who anointed the priests, did not himself undergo the rite. The Spirit anointed him

without the emblem. But Elijah was commanded to anoint Elisha to be prophet in his room. 4 As to the kings, the testimony is more clear. Elijah anointed Hazael to be king, which points back to an earlier ordinance. 5 The judges were not thus instituted. Joshua received the imposition of Moses' hands as one on whom the Spirit of consecration had already fallen.6 But, when Saul was given to Israel, Samuel took a vial of oil, and poured it upon his head, and kissed him, and said, is it not because the Lord hath anointed thee to be captain over His inheritance? 7 David, however, was the specific regal type of the Messiah. Then Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren; and the Spirit of the Lord came upon David from that day forward. 8 Designation and endowment with gifts were the two elements in the regal consecration: the former making the Lord's Anointed a sacred and inviolable person, and the latter insuring him every requisite grace for the administration of his office 1 Exodus 30:30; 2 Leviticus 8:30;

3 Leviticus 4:3; 4 1 Kings 19:16; 5 1 Kings 19:15; 6 Numbers 27:18; Numbers 27:23; 7 1 Samuel 10:1; 8 1 Samuel 16:13

2. Thus the anointing oil, the symbol of the Holy Ghost, had various meanings in the typical economy: meanings which were afterwards one in Christ. The prophetic anointing signified rather the setting apart of an organ for occasional influence: it pointed out one in whom the Spirit was already present. The priestly anointing indicated not so much mere appointment as consecration to the Divine service. The regal anointing superadded to the other meanings that of the permanent divine indwelling: the king was God's representative alone. The prophet and the king represented God and not man: the former, occasionally; the latter, permanently. The priest represented God to man, and man to God; his consecration was abiding, and affected all things connected with him. As in the case of the altar, whatsoever toucheth them shall be holy.1

1 Exodus 30:29

III. There are a few remarkable passages in which the future Redeemer is foreannounced as the Anointed One, the preeminent mashiychekaa, and in relation to these three offices distinctively

1. The Psalms open with the Great Name of the future, which was to be sanctified for ever as common to Christ and His people: The rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against His anointed. 1 Here is the regal office; and this is echoed in a later Psalm: God, Thy God, hath anointed Thee, 2 where the prophetic office is also referred to, and the priestly consecration is scarcely hid 1 Psalms 2:2; 2 Psa. 14:2,7,8

2. The Anointed One speaks of Himself through Isaiah: The Spirit of the Lord [God] is upon Me; 1 because the Lord hath anointed Me to preach good tidings. 2 Here is by our Lord's own interpretation the prophetic office: the only passage of this class which He quotes. Others He left for the use of His Apostles 1 Isaiah 61:1; 2 Luke 4:18

3. Daniel closes the Messianic prophecy proper by giving the name Messiah to the Future Redeemer, specifically as High Priest, but including His other offices. Three times he mentions the word. After threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for Himself: seventy weeks are determined . . . to make reconciliation for iniquity . . . and to anoint the Most Holy. 1 But He is Messiah the Prince; and His coming was to seal up the prophecy. Here are all the offices combined; this distinction and combination are the glory of Daniel's predictions 1 Daniel 9:24-26

IV. Hence in later Judaism a clear testimony was borne to the union of the three functions in One Supreme Person; and the Savior when He came found among the people a general expectation of the Messiah or Christ. He appealed to it as everywhere latent

1. The Targums, or Chaldaic paraphrases of the Scripture substituted for the Hebrew text in public reading after the Captivity, exhibit in very many passages a clear view of the Messiah in His offices. They call Him God; the King; the Prophet; the High Priest upon His throne; the promised Shiloh. They apply to Him all the passages which Christians are wont to apply. They make His two advents one, however, and regard the delay of the Messiah as caused by the sins of the people; at least this is the explanation of some of later date, when the critical periods indicated for the coming of Messiah were evidently overpast. Some Jewish authorities, it is true, invented a double Messiah; one, the Son of Joseph, in humiliation; the other, the Son of David, in glory. Others referred the predictions of sorrow to the Hebrew race, not to the Messiah: the People being the afflicted Servant of God. But before the time of Christ Jewish expectation took very much the form which is sketched in our own exposition of the Old Testament

2. The state of Messianic expectation in the time of our Lord may be gathered from the Gospels with great precision. The Christ was to come of the seed of David and out of the town of Bethlehem where David was. 1 The people were wont to ask, Is not this the Son of David?2 He was to be heralded by Elijah: Why then say the scribes that Elijah must first come? 3 He was to be the Anointed: He inquired of them where Christ should be born,4 Who had been announced to Simeon as the Lord's Christ. 5 Andrew's word to Simon was: We have found the Messiah, (which is, being interpreted, Christ). 6 So the people were accustomed to say, When Christ cometh, will He do more miracles than these which this man hath done? 7 He was expected in His three offices. As King especially, for the state of the Jewish people would endear that character: Where is He that is born King of the Jews or the Christ? 8 with which corresponds the final charge: saying that He Himself is Christ a King! 9 As Prophet also: of Him whom they would take by force to make Him a King, 10 they testified, This is of a truth the prophet that should come into the world. 11 There was no real difference between those who said, Of a truth this is the Prophet! and those who said, This is the Christ! Samaria shared the expectation of Christ as a prophet: I know that Messiah cometh, (Which is called Christ}: when He is come, He will tell us all things. 12 We have not the same direct evidence that the Messiah was expected to be a priest. It is plain, however, that the representatives of Judaism who welcomed the Child Jesus waited for a priestly Messiah Zacharias, Simeon, and the Baptist all regarded Him as the incarnation of God Who visited and redeemed His people, 13 not by the right hand of His power simply, but by the remission of their sins, 14 through the sacrifice of the Lamb of God Which taketh away the sin of the world. 15 But here the popular expectation faltered and failed. The Christ was expected as the Son of God which should come into the world, 16 that abideth for ever 17 upon earth: as the pledge of the Divine presence, and life, and power among men; as the Head of a new kingdom of heaven and as the vindicator and redeemer of God's ancient people. But as the High Priest, Himself the Offerer and the Offering, they did not recognize their Messiah. Hence no part of our Lord's sayings was more offensive than those in which He spoke of His flesh given for the life of the world. 18 The common people were one with the Pharisees and Scribes, and the disciples themselves differed little from them, in the carnality of their hopes. Be it far from Thee, Lord! 19 said Simon Peter, when under the teaching not of the Father but of flesh and blood; and in these words the Lord perceived not

only the timorous loyalty of one who loved Him, but also the blinding agency of Satan, whose object was to merge the priestly office of the Messiah in the two others: to induce the nation to regard Him only as a supreme Teacher and a mighty King. Peter's híleoós soi kúrie was not from above but from below. Such theories of the Messiah holding the prophetic and regal offices alone and without the priestly bond between them, have been the watchwords of most of the errors of the Christian Church concerning the work of Christ

1 John 7:42; 2 Matthew 12:23; 3 Matthew 17:10; 4 Matthew 2:4; 5 Luke 2:26; 6 John 1:41; 7 John 7:31; 8 Matthew 2:2; Matthew 2:4; 9 Luke 23:2; 10 John 6:14-15; 11 John 7:40-41; 12 John 4:25; 13 Luke 1:68; 14 Luke 1:77; 15 John 1:29; 16 John 11:27; 17 John 12:34; 18 John 6:51-52; 19 Matthew 16:22

3. It is well known that at the time of our Saviour's advent the world at large was familiar with the Jewish expectation, and even shared it. The Desire of the People was the Desire of the Nations also. The coming of the Magi was a testimony to this: the blessing of the Spirit resting upon the seed sown in the Captivity. Outside the Scripture we read: " Percrebuerat Oriente toto vetus et constans opinio esse in fatis ut eo tempore Judaea profecti rerum potirentur." And again: " Pluribus persuasio inerat anti-quis sacerdotum literis contineri eo ipso tempore fore ut valesceret oriens, profectique Judaea rerum potirentur." 4. Finally, all this will explain the appeals of the early preachers of the Faith Contending with the Jews the Apostles constantly made it their aim to prove that Jesus was the Messiah: so St. Paul reasoned that this Jesus, Whom I preach unto you, is Christ.1 Here was to the Jewish people, always and everywhere, the theme of all argument and preaching. Preaching to the Gentiles, they skillfully touched the same great Messianic desire, known to be latent in all hearts: there are glimpses of this in the New Testament, but much more evident illustrations in the Apologetics of the first two centuries. The history of Christian Missions in all ages adds its tribute. The Gospel never fails of a response when it speaks to the indestructible hope of a Deliverer, whose coming the world has longed for ever since it began its career of wandering from God

1 Acts 17:3 THE CHRIST OF FULFILMENT As the Messiah or Christ of Fulfillment our Lord accomplished in Himself all the types and symbols and prophecies of the Old Testament. The holy oil of unction is in the New Testament the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Christ's anointing in two senses: first, as consecrating His Person in the Incarnation; and, secondly, as consecrating Him to His offices at the Baptism THE PERSONAL UNCTION Our Lord in His Person is the Lord's Anointed. As such He is the Messiah of the Old Testament come in the flesh; and the Mediator between God and men in both natures as united in one Person

I. At the Saviour's birth He was declared to be a Savior, which is Christ the Lord; Simeon saw the Lord's Christ. 1 And He was so called, not in anticipation only, but because in His incarnation or conception His human nature was sanctified and consecrated, essentially separated from the sin of our race by the Holy Ghost. The body of humanity thus prepared for Him He assumed before it came to personal and independent subsistence, and insured its eternal sinlessness. He was the Lord's Christ, even as He was Jesus, from the instant of His conception. And, as the term Mediator is bound up with the term Christ, He was the Mediator in His incarnation, before the mediating act of atonement was accomplished 1 Luke 2:11; Luke 2:26

II. Hence all the future functions of the Christ must be attributed to neither of His natures distinctively, but to His one Person. Our Lord, as Mediator, is not divided

1. He sustains no office which is not based upon His Divinity, and executed through His human nature. As Prophet He is still the only-begotten God, Which is in the bosom of the Father, 1 Whom as Man He hath declared to men. As Priest He is the Son Who learned obedience by the things which He suffered; 2 it behoved Him, as the Son, to be made like unto His brethren, 3 and, taken from among men, to make propitiation for the sins of the people. 4 The Church of God, or the Lord, was purchased with His own blood; 5 and the High Priest offered Himself through the Eternal Spirit 6 of His Divinity. So also His Kingly authority, exercised in human nature, requires as its foundation the Divine dignity of the Son Who upholdeth all things by the word of His power. 7 The first verses of the Epistle to the Hebrews contain the three offices of the one Incarnate Person in their most complete and grandest exhibition 1 John 1:18; 2 Hebrews 5:8; 3 Hebrews 5:1; 4 Hebrews 2:17; 5 Acts 20:28; 6 Hebrews 9:14; 7 Hebrews 1:3

2. The Incarnate Person is the one Mediator: not the human nature as some Romanists have affirmed; not the Divine nature as Osiander and some other Protestants maintained; but the one Theanthropic Agent whose mediatorial volition is one in the unity of the Divine and human wills. Hence the word Mediator has a unique meaning as descriptive of the Christ: There is one Mediator between God and men, rather, of God and men, the Man Christ Jesus, 1 rather, Jesus Christ Man. This passage, solitary as marking the union of the two natures in relation to the Christ as such, is supported by others testifying that He became afterwards the Mediator of the New Covenant, in which Moses was His type In the former—His incarnate mediation—He had and could have no type. As the one Mediator His Person Incarnate is the Agent of all His doctrine, of all His sacrificial acts, and of all His authority as King. He teaches as the Word speaking in human language; He atones and intercedes as the High Priest taken from among men, but first given to man as the Son; and He rules as the Eternal Son to Whom in the flesh all power is mediatorially and economically committed

1 1 Timothy 2:5

3. It follows that our Lord, as in His own Person the fulfillment of the promises concerning Christ, gathered all types into one before He entered upon the distributive functions of His several offices. He is the unity of God and man; and the unity of all the distinct elements of the predicted Mediatorial Ministry. No one man ever united the three offices. Moses was prophet or lawgiver, but, strictly speaking, neither priest nor king David was king and prophet, but not priest. Melchizedek was priest and king, but not prophet. Ezekiel was prophet and priest, but not king. And where the functions were united in one person, they were still distinct: he who occasionally prophesied might occasionally act as priest. Though each office was permanent in some cases, as in Moses, Aaron, and David, never were two or three of these offices permanent in one office bearer. But in the one Person of the Incarnate all these offices are united, in their perfection, in their constant exercise, and each as necessary to the other. He is always the Light of the world, always the Life of redemption, always the Ruler of mankind OFFICIAL UNCTION AT BAPTISM Our Lord’s second or official unction was received at His Baptism, which was His public designation or sealing to the Messianic office, and the full equipment of His human nature for its discharge. After His baptism He assumed at successive intervals the three offices distinctively;

and began to fulfill them. After His ascent He continued them all in perfection; and will not lay them down until the end. The beginnings of the Messianic work are recorded in the Gospels; its consummation is exhibited in the Apostolic testimony

I. The Baptism of Christ to His office was the effusion upon Him of the Holy Spirit: marking Him out as the Messiah, and at the same time replenishing Him, as to His human nature, with all Messianic gifts. This outpouring from heaven was preceded by a baptism of water, shared by our Lord with men generally as the baptism of repentance, but which had a special twofold significance in regard to Him

1. Jesus was baptized by His Forerunner, who was both the representative of the old economy and the preacher of repentance for the new. (1.) In the former relation the Baptist performed on the Person of the Christian High Priest the washing which preceded His anointing with the Holy Ghost. The typical high priests in particular were washed before they were anointed; and anointing generally was preceded by baptism. (2.) In the latter relation the preacher of repentance administered the baptismal pledge of penitent waiting for the Messiah, to One who, though the Messiah Himself, was also the representative of sinful man. Thus in the case of our Lord's descent into the Jordan two ends were accomplished: on the one hand, He was baptized as the Head and Surety of the human race assuming in its symbol the transgression of mankind; and, on the other, He was designated as the Messiah in whom were combined all the offices to which His types were of old anointed. In the former sense His baptism represented a sin assumed but not shared; He was already numbered with the transgressors 1 at the Jordan, and came by water before He came by blood. 2 The Baptism was a prelude of the Crucifixion. In the latter, it represented the perfect purity which His preeminent ministry required; the water represented not the cleansing from sin but the absence of the need of purification 1 Isaiah 53:12; 2 1 John 5:6

2. The Baptism of the Holy Ghost must be viewed as the designation of Christ to His work as the Representative of the Holy Trinity, and the equipment of His human nature with all the gifts necessary for His mission

(1.) When John was sent to his ministry he was told that the Messiah would be indicated to him by a higher baptism than his own: Upon Whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on Him, the same is He which baptized with the Holy Ghost The symbol was beheld by the Baptist, who came, baptizing with water, that the Baptizer with the Spirit should be made manifest to Israel; and of the token of the Spirit's descent he says, / saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God. 1 The Holy Trinity united in this designation. The voice from heaven was that of the Father; it proclaimed that the Man Christ Jesus was at the same time His beloved Son; 2 and John saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and lighting upon Him. 3 Thus was the Lord marked out to His forerunner, who before knew Him not; and that forerunner in his turn marked Him out to the world, which also in another sense as yet knew Him not 1 John 1:31; John 1:33-34; 2 Matthew 3:16-17; 3 John 1:31

(2.) According to the ancient prophecy, the Spirit was to descend upon the Messiah in the sevenfold unity and distribution of His perfect gifts. It was said of the Branch of the root of Jesse: and the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord. 1 Concerning this gift which replenished the human nature of the Redeemer, or His Person as represented by His humanity,

the Baptist said: God giveth not the Spirit by measure [unto Him]. 2 And it is this gift that He distributes to His people: what He has for us without measure He distributes by measure to us. Long afterward he who testified of these things gave the first and the last formal expression of the privilege of believers to share their Master's anointing: ye have an unction from the Holy One, 3 where the chrísma is from the Holy One who needed no anointing for His own soul but reserved it for ours: that we might be Christians as He is the Christ. The disciples were CALLED—but not MADE—Christians first in Antioch.4 1 Isaiah 11:2; 2 John 3:34; 3 1 John 2:20; 4 Acts 11:26

II. Our Lord formally assumed His three offices at certain set times, each of which is solemnly recorded by an Evangelist

1. As the Messiah generally He always spoke and acted as having in Himself the unity of these functions from the beginning. But during His humbled estate, and until He had fulfilled His chief office, that of making atonement, He maintained a certain reserve, and only by degrees declared the full mystery of His work. He began by declaring Himself to be the Lawgiver and Teacher: that is, by assuming His prophetic office. And this function He discharged alone until the eve of His departure; when, in His self-consecrating prayer, He assumed the ministry of His High-priesthood, and offered Himself a sacrifice for sin

Having accomplished that, He assembled His disciples around Him after the resurrection and assumed His royal authority: the power given to Him in heaven and upon earth

2. But this was also IN heaven FOR earth; the Savior ascended to discharge all His offices above; and the Acts and the Epistles contain that full theological development of their meaning which was not possible until the Holy Spirit had come down at Pentecost. The later New Testament is no other than the expansion of the Saviour's own doctrine concerning His Messianic work. We must therefore take each several office and consider our Lord's own testimony and that of His Apostles based upon it

3. The offices of Christ will be laid down at the last day. Though He will for ever retain the hypostatic unity of His Person, the mediatorial economy will cease. Not the regal office alone will terminate, but all His offices. He will come without sin: 1 that is, without His priestly relation to sin. He will no longer be the Revealer; for God shall be all in all. 2 But this will be viewed hereafter with respect to the several functions 1 Hebrews 9:28; 2 1 Corinthians 15:28 THE PROPHETIC OFFICE

Christ as Prophet is, generally, the perfect Revealer of Divine Truth to mankind: as such He comes with His supreme credentials, the Truth, and the Light of men. More particularly He was, during His earthly ministry, the Lawgiver and the Preacher of the Gospel: each distinctly, but both in one. This office, filled by Himself, was fulfilled through His word by the Holy Ghost A distinction must be noted here between the absolute or universal office of Christ as Revealer, and His economical office as the Minister of His own generation. It may serve a good purpose to consider the latter first as being transitional to the former THE PERSONAL MINISTRY

St. Paul affirms that Christ was made a Minister of the Circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers, and that the Gentiles might glorify God for His mercy. 1 These words have reference to the office of Christ generally, but particularly as the Revealer of the Divine will to the Jews and for the Gentiles: as to the former, in the re-enactment of the Law; as to the latter, in the preaching of the Gospel Here, then, we may consider the Ministry generally, and

then its two branches

1 Romans 15:8-9

I. Our Lord's personal prophetic ministry constitutes the substance of the teaching of the Word in the Four Gospels

1. It was strictly a continuation of the ancient prophetic economy, according to the argument of St. Stephen: This is that Moses, which said unto the, children of Israel, A Prophet shall [the Lord your] God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; [Him shall ye hear]. 1 So far as concerned His relation to the old dispensation Christ was the last of the prophets; as the people said, that a great prophet is risen up among us. 2 Jesus accepted the woman's word: Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet; 3 as also the similar language of the Emmaus disciples. He intimated, indeed, that all the prophets and the law prophesied untilJohn 4:1-54 and that even John was more than a prophet. 5 How much was He greater Himself! So also in the Epistle to the Hebrews a distinction is made between the prophets by Whom God spake to the fathers and the Son by Whom or in Whom He speaks to us. 6 But all this does not interfere with the fact that our Lord was a Minister of the Divine will to His own nation. No prophet is accepted in his own country:7 these words, spoken when He opened His ministry, paralleled His own coming with that of Elijah to Israel 1 Acts 7:37; 2 Luke 7:16; 3 John 4:19; 4 Luke 24:19; 5 Matthew 11:9; 6 Hebrews 1:1; 7 Luke 4:24

2. Hence the Redeemer's mission was confined to the ancient people: I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. 1 The Light visited Galilee and Samaria, but it did not go beyond Israel and its lost sheep: the Prophet of the whole world took up His abode in Galilee of the Gentiles, 2 so that the people which sat in darkness saw great light. 3 Anticipating the time when He would draw all nations to Him, He nevertheless strictly limited Himself to the Holy Land, and never had the dust of heathenism to shake from His feet. He was never called a Jew, nor did He so term Himself, but He was a Messenger to the Jews, a MINISTER OF THE CIRCUMCISION, and, in a sense, AS ONE OF THE PROPHETS 1 Matthew 15:24; 2 Matthew 4:15-16; 3 Romans 15:8

3. The Saviour's personal ministry was that of an extraordinary Prophet raised up to introduce a new dispensation of which He was Himself the herald. He blended in His own Person the ancient Prophet and the more modern Rabbi: sent sometimes suddenly under a Divine extraordinary afflatus, like a Zealot responsible only to God; or lifting up occasional burdens, subsequently written down, after the more ordinary though still extra-ordinary manner of the prophets; and also gathering around Him a body of disciples whom He taught out of the law, according to the usage of the Rabbinical schools

4. The style and methods of our Lord's teaching were such as to mark Him out from every other teacher. Its characteristics were unshared: as His form and features, for ever lost to human knowledge, were His own and no other's, so was it with His ordinary communications. He possessed or rather condescended to assume in its perfection the gift of persuasive speech: as it was predicted that He should be fairer than the children of men, so also it was said of Him, Grace is poured into Thy lips. 1 They confessed; it who were astonished at His doctrine, for His word was with power, 2 as also those who were disarmed by its grace: never man spake like ThisMan 1:3 His method of teaching by parable was original and unrivalled: there is scarcely any trace of its

use in the Old Testament; and such allegories as are found in other Oriental teaching and in the Talmud are in perfect contrast to our Lord's. His illustrations from nature and life are confessed to be the most beautiful in literature even by those who are unwilling to admit that they sprang from One Who knew the mysterious symbols of nature because He ordained them and Who was perfectly acquainted with the human heart. His method of dealing with enemies, or captious censors, betrays the presence of every element of dialectic or Socratic skill. And, like almost all great teachers, He had the esoteric instruction for the more susceptible and humble, to unfold the mysteries which were veiled from the prejudiced in parabolic disguise. Moreover, He aptly appropriated the good of the Rabbinical theology, and knew how to accommodate Himself to current delusions while correcting them, as in the case of His appeal concerning the casting out of the demons by the children of His enemies. Jesus also was the supreme Master of the symbol and symbolical action; and to that Christianity owes much. But, on this whole subject it is difficult to speak with fullness or precision, as our Saviour's personal instructions have come to us through the medium of His servants. He has left us nothing under the direct impress of His own hand 1 Psalms 14:2; 2 Luke 4:32; 3 John 7:46

5. It is important to remember that throughout our Lord's ministry He was at once the Minister of the circumcision and the Revealer of all truth for the world. The blending of these gives an indescribable and most wonderful grace to His teaching. But this leads us to a higher view than that which has hitherto been taken

II. Jesus Christ was the last Lawgiver, and the First Evangelist of His own glad tidings; His whole ministry united the Law and the Gospel in their essential elements

1. As the LAWGIVER, like unto Moses 1 but greater than he, our Lord assumed His function on the Mount of Beatitudes. He rose up out of the Old Testament as the Witness and Embodiment of its truth, and was in no sense its destroyer. He came not to abolish but to fulfill ancient Scripture, and that in three senses: first, to fulfill its meaning in Himself as it was all one prophecy of Him; secondly, to discharge it of its functions as it was the law of a transient ceremonial economy which He appeared to end; and, thirdly, by republishing its moral teaching in harmony with the new dispensation as a dispensation of the Spirit and of love 1 Deuteronomy 18:15

(1.) All previous lawgiving, whether engraven on the fleshly tables of the heart of universal mankind, or on the Mosaic tables and in the Mosaic books, was fulfilled in the revelation of Jesus, the Incarnate Expression of God's will to man. Christ is the end of the law: 1 and in this sense pre-eminently, that all revelation, both of the wrath and of the mercy of God, was complete and fulfilled in His Person. He came as the Representative of all written and unwritten revelation: so entirely to take its place that in His presence there was necessity for nothing more: whether He would or would not supersede all, it remained for Him to show. On earth as well as in heaven there was no need of the sun, the Lamb was the light thereof. He said, / am the Light of the world, 2 and I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life. 3 But He was pleased to continue still the dispensation of word and ministry that He for a time suspended. The ancients gave Him their books, and He resanctified them for His Church. When He retired He continued His function by a more enlarged revelation through His Apostles 1 Romans 10:4; 2 John 8:12; 3 John 14:6

(2.) Our Savior, the final Lawgiver, abolished the old law, and all that it contained, so far as it was the basis of a covenant between God and a peculiar people. As a code of the Theocracy, the law

was political, ceremonial, and moral: three in one and inseparably in one. This law our Lord carne to abrogate: it was done away in Him, because the new covenant was to be no longer with one nation, and no longer based upon types, but to be confirmed in Christ with all nations on the basis of the accomplished redemption. The entire economy commonly called the Law, as one, and therefore as such including the moral law in its statutory form, was abolished in Christ, Who established a new legislation, known variously as the perfect law of liberty,1 the law of faith, 2 the law of the Spirit of life.3 1 James 1:25; 2 Romans 3:27; 3 Romans 8:2 (3.) But the moral law, written on the heart and on the two tables, Jesus reuttered

Extracting it from its place in the Legal Economy He gave it all its honors in the Economy of Grace. Though He abolished it as a condition of salvation, He confirmed it as a rule of life. To be more particular: He renewed it first as it was a schoolmaster, to teach the sinner his sin, and bring him to his Savior; and then as a rule and standard of holy living; but, for both purposes, the whole law is exhibited in its internal character as a spiritual rule and in its great principle as perfect love. As the Lawgiver our Lord expanded ethical teaching into an infinite extent and breadth by a spiritual interpretation; and condensed it all again into a perfect simplicity by reducing it to love. The spiritual application multiplies the precept past any limits; the reduction of all to charity makes it simple and comparatively easy again. But the Savior as Lawgiver presides over another department of theology, that of Christian Ethics, to come hereafter

2. The New Legislator opened His ministry on the Mount; but as the Prophet, preaching His own Gospel, greater than Isaiah but like him, our Lord announced His function formally in the Synagogue at Nazareth where He had been brought up.1 1 Luke 4:16

(1.) The Gospel proper, as the glad tidings of redemption through atonement and the forgiveness of sins, could not be fully preached before the Cross. Jesus, during His life on earth, was rather a Lawgiver than an Evangelist. But when He said in His own synagogue, This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears, 1 He began to preach the great deliverance. The text He chose was the most comprehensive that prophecy afforded for the description of the effects of redemption as finally administered to its objects

Concerning this opening stage of His ministry St. Matthew records that Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom. 2 From that time the re-publication of the Law and the anticipation of the Gospel alternated or were combined in the Saviour's works and words. He spoke of the perfect law that convinces of sin, and also of a free forgiveness: always being a jealous assertor of the Divine claims even while frankly and abundantly promising and even imparting remission. But it was not till the sacrifice had been offered that our Lord preached Himself as the perfect Lawgiver and the finished Savior. When He sent His Apostles forth He bade that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, 3 who were to be taught to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded.4 1 Luke 4:21; 2 Matthew 4:23; 3 Luke 24:47; 4 Matthew 28:20

(2.) The preaching of the future Gospel was always predictive; but Christ was more expressly the Prophet of His own kingdom in His foreannouncements of its history and destiny. As all prophecy from the beginning of the world had respect, directly or indirectly, to the kingdom of the Messiah, so the Great Prophet and consummator of the prophetic word constantly spoke of the future of His Church. Towards the end of His ministry almost all His discourses were directly prophetic; and His

last utterances were almost entirely limited to predictions

(3.) Both the preaching and the prophecy of the Gospel kingdom our Lord continued after His departure by the ministry of His Apostles. As they wrought greater works 1 than He, so they spoke greater words than His; but as in the former they were only the instruments of His higher and more spiritual energy, so they were only the speakers of His words, which could not be spoken until He had accomplished His work on the cross. St. Luke speaks of the Divine-human ministry as of all that Jesus began both to do and teach. 2 After His ascension He continued all His offices: all through His own activity, but with a difference. The High-priestly function He discharges alone: the Kingly by the Holy Ghost; the Prophetic by the Spirit through the Apostles. In the nature of things He could not perfectly preach His own Gospel; nor could He give explicit prophecies of the last dispensation until the former dispensation was fully ended. He Himself in His own Person only began: He perfected nothing. His words were seed in the hearts of the Apostles, to bear fruit in due season. The Spirit Whom He would send was the Spirit of truth, 3 and would guide them into all its developments; but only as bringing their Master's own words back to their memory. Precisely what the Redeemer did for the old Law—recall it to the people's remembrance with enlarged interpretation—the Spirit did for the Redeemer's own ministry. This has reference to every part of His prophetic office 1 John 14:12; 2 Acts 1:1; 3 John 16:13 THE UNIVERSAL MINISTRY

Jesus never formally assumed the prophetic office in its highest meaning, in that meaning which was peculiar and unshared: which He could not indeed assume because He was never without it. He spoke as One who not only brought the final revelation with Him, but as being Himself that revelation; He distinguished Himself from all other teachers by the assertion of absolute personal authority; He accompanied His teaching with credentials of miraculous works wrought in His own name; and, lastly, He came as the Prophet of mankind, making provision for the continuance of His doctrine for ever

1. While He appeared as a second Moses Jesus distinguished Himself from human teachers as being Himself the revelation of all truth. He never appropriated the name Prophet, or Rabbi, or Seer, though He did not decline these titles when given to Him. But again and again He asserted concerning Himself such prerogatives as could belong to no human agent of Divine instruction. He said of Himself, I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life. 1 All things pertaining to man's life, present and future, to his salvation and spiritual interests in time and eternity, our Lord connects with His own Person and manifestation Not only is He the Giver and the Medium of the gift: He is the Gift itself. Receiving what is His depends upon receiving Himself. He is all the truth, as it respects our race, concrete and personified. All revelation is in His Person: He is the union of all that is God and all that is man, and nothing beyond this has vital concern for mankind. Here is the great distinction between Christ and every other prophet. He is God and He is Man; and His Person is the compendium and substance of all that may and must be known concerning both. In this highest sense He is neither a prophet nor a seer: He declares Himself. Even God is revealed only as connected with Him: as His Father. This glorious distinction pervades our Lord's words. When He promises the Spirit to guide His disciples, it is Himself Whom the Spirit is to expound: we must connect I am THE TRUTH with the Spirit of truth and He will guide you into all truth. 2 I AM THE TRUTH was the loftiest word of Christ the Prophet 1 John 14:6; 2 John 14:6; John 14:17; John 16:13 2. In His mediatorial person, however, our Lord condescended to be literally a Prophet

He used His human nature as the organ of His revelation, and as Man speaking to men was the consummate agent of Divine counsel for mankind. He was the perfect naabiy, which means the Interpreter of God, or one who pours forth the Divine words. Thus He said of Himself, My doctrine is not Mine, but His that sent Me: 1 not meaning literally that it was not His, but that it was not His as distinguished from God. As My Father hath taught Me, I speak these things: 2 words which must be connected with what follows, and He that sent Me is with Me. He was also the perfect chazah, Seer, or, more poetically, chazeen. What He hath seen and heard, that He testifieth: 3 this was declared by the Baptist concerning Christ, of Whom he also said, He that cometh from heaven is above all. Through the eyes of His human spirit the God-man saw the mysteries of His own kingdom. As Prophet and Seer in His incarnate Person He was in some sense limited. In the unity of His Father and the Holy Spirit He was a Revealer to Himself in His own human faculties of the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, hidden 4 in Himself for a season from His own humanity, and gave His mortal vision to behold what He communicated. In His prophetic knowledge and utterances we see what the human mind is capable of knowing in union with the Divine. After His resurrection, or rather after His ascension, there was no longer any restraint, and the human faculties of the Divinehuman person were the organ of the perfect revelation of all such knowledge as man can ever have on need 1 John 7:16; 2 John 7:28-29; 3 John 3:31-32; 4 Colossians 2:3

3. The Credentials of our Lord’s prophetic office were in harmony with His twofold character, as sent first to His own generation and thus raised up for the world

(1.) As a Minister of the Circumcision He gave such demonstration by miracle as became an authoritative messenger from God: precisely so much and no more. The leading wonders and signs of the ancient prophets were types of His miraculous works, which as performed by Himself or His Apostles—for their works were His—ended the reign of evidential signs

(2.) But, as the Supreme Revealer, He did not lay stress on His miracles, because He was Himself the Miracle of miracles. All that preceded and followed were only faint preludes and echoes of His one great Wonder, the manifestation of God in the flesh, His resurrection from the dead, and His glorification of human nature. If ye believe not that I AM, ye shall die in your sins, and, when ye have lifted up the Son of Man, then shall ye know that I Amos 1:1-15 Here was the secret of the authority with which He spoke. His words and His actions had in them a Divine and irresistible self-evidencing attestation. He never used the language of an Old-Testament prophet, The Word of the Lord came unto me, 2 or the Spirit of the Lord came 3 upon me, but, Verily, verily, I say unto you! 4 He did not lay claim to inspiration, the influence under which the prophets poured forth their words and the seers saw their visions: He was not God-inspired but God Incarnate. Hence the constant tenor of His declaration to the effect that every one that is of the truth heareth My voice, 5 and that if any man will do, or wills to do, His will he shall know of the doctrine.6 HEAR HIM! 7 was spoken concerning the Revealer when His Divine nature was made more intensely manifest in the flesh at the Transfiguration 1 John 8:24; John 8:28; 2 2 Chronicles 15:1; 3 John 10:7; 4 John 18:37; 5 John 7:17; 6 Luke 9:35; 7 1 Timothy 3:16

4. Finally, the Ministry of Jesus as the Apostle of our profession was the final revelation for the world. It is important to mark this, as it has a close connection with the ultimate appeal on every theological subject and the rule of faith in the Christian Church. In Him all past, present and future teaching was one

(1.) Our Lord always assumes a tone of absolute finality. With Him the prophetic office ceased: prophecy, like the law, found its end in Christ. There is no other revelation, no other messenger from God after Him. Whatever other teachers arose were simply men from His feet, bearing His words and expounding them more fully under the influence of the Spirit. Nothing can be more express than His assertions that every future word of instruction should be only His own word continued and developed

(2.) Before He departed He made provision for the continuance of His own function in the Christian Church. Without doubt He executes His prophetic office from His throne in the heavens. His Apostolic company perpetuated such of His words as were of permanent value for mankind. One of that company was brought under teaching who ever declared that what of new or enlarged doctrine he had for the world was given him by revelation of Christ, and it was he who said, Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly. 1 Our Lord Himself repeated from heaven His direct instructions: the Seven Churches received them for all By His last inspired Apostle, however, He has said that all Christians have an unction from the Holy One, and so know all things. 2 Thus by His Spirit, who is this Unction, the Supreme Revealer continues to execute His prophetic office in the Church generally, and in every individual Christian 1 Colossians 3:16; 2 1 John 2:20 THE PRIESTLY OFFICE The central and most important office of our Lord's mediatorship is His priesthood, of which the high priest, as the representative of the Levitical system of expiations, was the type. As Prophet our Lord predicted and asserted His sacrificial work; but He more formally assumed it on the eve of His passion, and after His ascension revealed its full import by the Apostles. According to their teaching the Saviour's priestly office consists of Offering and Presentation of Himself the sacrifice, answering to His death and ascension; also of Intercession and Benediction, both based upon the sacrificial Atonement, and connected with the administration of salvation

Much of our Lord's prophetic ministry as the Prophet of His own dispensation was occupied with the announcement, prediction and exposition of His priestly atonement

1. When He began to preach He took up His forerunner's word, which was twofold: Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand! 1 and, Behold the Lamb of God, Which taketh away the sin of the world! 2 Very gradually, and by hints left for future enlargement, He unfolded the doctrine both of His priesthood and of His kingdom. Though He never called Himself a Priest—not even indirectly, as He called Himself Prophet and King—He constantly used language which only this office explains. He did not actually say that He was the High Priest, the Sacrifice and the Offerer; nevertheless He applied to Himself and His mission almost every sacrificial usage and every sacrificial idea. This will appear evident from a cursory examination of the Gospel of St. John, in which we find the sacerdotal office made prominent: the Synoptists keep rather in view the regal 1 Matthew 3:2; 2 John 1:29

2. It is observable that our Lord before the Transfiguration did not dwell much on His coming death. According to St. John He had spoken of Himself as the Bread of God which cometh down from heaven and giveth life unto the world; 1 this however was based rather upon the manna in the wilderness 2 than upon the sacrificial feasts, though the transition to the latter is found in the words: the bread that I will give is My flesh, [which I will give] for the life of the world. 3 On the Holy Mount our Lord was evidently prepared for the last stage of His mediatorial history on earth. The subject of discourse was the decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem. 4 The decease

referred to His exodus or departure generally; but we may suppose that, as the victim was anciently examined by the priest, in order to ascertain its integrity, so the glory of heaven searched Jesus through and through: the result was, This is My beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased. 5 He was approved by the Father as the Spotless Sacrifice for the world. From that time our Lord began to predict the fact, the circumstances and the results of His death. Now He began to testify of His Cross, to those who much wondered at His words Still, while His language and teachings revolved around the altar, they were not directly sacrificial, even when He spoke of the Son of Man come not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many.6 1 John 6:33; 2 John 6:49; 3 John 6:51; 4 Luke 9:31; 5 Matthew 17:5; 6 Matthew 20:28

3. It was on the eve of the Sacrifice of the Cross that our Lord solemnly assumed His sacerdotal function: first, by the institution of the Supper, the memorial sacrifice of Christianity; and, secondly, by what is sometimes called the High-priestly prayer; the symbolical Feet washing having been interposed with an affecting relation to both. The sacramental institute is pervaded by sacrificial ideas: it exhibits the true paschal Lamb Whose blood is at the same time shed for the remission of sins in virtue of a new covenant ratified by blood of propitiation, and the benefit of Whose death is celebrated in a continual peace-offering feast. The High-priestly prayer was the self-consecration of Jesus to the final endurance of the sorrows of expiation. All the Messianic offices are hallowed in that supreme Prayer. The prophetic: I have given them Thy word; the regal: as Thou hast given Him power over all flesh; the priestly: I sanctify Myself, that they also may be sanctified. 1 But it is pre-eminently the consecration prayer of the High Priest: the formal assumption, in the presence of the cross, His altar, of His atoning work 1 John 17:14; John 17:2; John 17:19

4. After Pentecost the sacerdotal office of Christ, previously the least prominent, takes the leading place. Its full exposition is mainly to be found in the Epistle to the Hebrews; but every other document of the New Testament contains explicit references to some of its relations. Taking that Epistle as the text, and the rest as illustrative, we may view all under the two aspects of Sacrifice followed by Presentation, and Intercession followed by Benediction. But first the mediatorial character of the Redeemer as High Priest must be viewed as the foundation of the whole, its leading elements being these: in the presentation of the sacrifice the High Priest represented the people to God; in the benediction He represented God to the people. He was in ancient times, and is in Christ, taken from among men; 1 but then as now his function looked towards both heaven and earth

1 Hebrews 5:1 THE HIGH PRIEST AND CHRIST The High Priest represented the priesthood generally, and was the type of Christ as the universal Antitype of all sacerdotal persons and ministries. We need only observe the points of correspondence, as also the points of difference, between type and Antitype: especially in regard to the high-priestly vocation, consecration, and functions

1. The vocation of the priesthood generally, and of the high priest in particular, was connected with the Levitical typical service alone. Before the time of Moses, the natural head of every family was also its religious head: wherever Abram went he built there an altar unto the Lord; 1 and when the paschal sacrifice was instituted, the father of the family discharged the priest’s function. Moses absorbed for a season all offices into himself, that they might be again distributed. He was not only the lawgiver but the priest also: as it is written, and Moses took half of the blood, and put it in

basins; and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar. 2 He assigned the priesthood to his brother Aaron, as the head of an hereditary sacerdotal order: the rest of the same tribe being set apart to subordinate ministries. Hence there were Levites not priests; ordinary priests of the Levitical tribe; and the hereditary high priest or head of the family of Aaron. This Chief Priest was therefore the representative of all, called from out of the people to represent the people as seeking approach to God by sacrificial gifts. In the New Testament we are told that no man taketh the honor unto himself, but when he is called of God, as was Aaron. So Christ also glorified not Himself to be made a high priest; but He that said unto Him, Thou art My Son, to-day have I begotten Thee. 3 The eternal Son, begotten of the Holy Ghost in human nature, was fully constituted the Messiah, and given to the world as such, in the Incarnation as finished in the resurrection. Hence He was named of God a high priest after the order of Melchisedec: 4 his high-priesthood was solely of Divine origin, it was that of a king also and it was eternal 1 Genesis 13:1-18 L18; 2 Exodus 24:6; 3 Hebrews 5:4-5; 4 Hebrews 5:10

2. The ceremonial of consecration, as used by Moses, began with washing at the door of the tabernacle; 1 followed by investiture with the high-priestly array; and upon the sacred person thus washed and clothed the oil of anointing was poured forth. 2 In connection with this a sin-offering was sacrificed for removal of guilt, a burnt-offering to express entire consecration, and a peace-offering to show God's acceptance. But the oil was the sanctification: and he poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron's head, and anointed him, to sanctify him. 3 The high priest was wayimshach: the priest who is higher than his brethren, upon whose head the anointing oil was poured, 4 poured in abundance. Our Lord was consecrated to His office by the Holy Ghost Whom He received without measure: Him hath God the Father sealed. 5 All other particulars of the typical consecration fell away, unless the baptism of Christ responded to the washing of the High Priest. But the essential difference was in this, that Christ, while He received as incarnate the Spirit of anointing, did also consecrate Himself: for their sakes I SANCTIFY MYSELF.6 By the Divine glory of His Sonship He dedicated His Person and His being to the propitiation of the sins of men 1 Exodus 29:1-46; 2 Leviticus 8:1-36; 3 Leviticus 8:12; 4 Leviticus 21:10; 5 John 6:27; 6 John 17:19
3. The function of the High Priest requires careful consideration in its typical reference to the Great Antitype

(1.) As to his person and his office a mediator generally, for all the people and for every individual he was the one and only priest. He was the embodied unity of the priesthood: he alone virtually represented the people to God and God to the people. His garments indicated this: without his distinctive vestments he was a common man. The breastplate, as also the shoulder-pieces attached to the ephod, bore the names of the tribes upon it: he who wore this sacred symbol represented all the tribes of the congregation, bearing them as it were both on his heart and on his shoulders. Hence also upon his diadem was the inscription HOLINESS TO THE LORD . . . And it shall be upon Aaron's forehead, that Aaron may bear the iniquity of the holy things, which the children of Israel shall hallow in all their holy gifts; and it shall be always upon his forehead, that they may be accepted before the Lord. 1 The antitypical High Priest, the Redeemer of mankind, was the Representative of the whole world, bearing the sins of His people upon His heart, and the government of them upon His shoulders, presenting them before God as expiated and reconciled 1 Exodus 28:36-38

(2.) But the high priest represented God also to the congregation: the breastplate with its inscription was called the Urim and Thummim, that is, Lights and Perfections; being the same precious stones which bore the names of the tribes regarded as pledges of light by inspiration from above on all occasions of public appeal to God. In this prerogative of the high priest he was the type of the prophetic as well as priestly office of Him who came as the Apostle and High Priest of our confession. 1 The office of blessing the congregation was common to the priesthood, but in its highest annual discharge on the day of atonement, when the nation was accepted as a whole, it was the high priest's act alone, as will be hereafter seen. The Epistle to the Hebrews—the Temple Epistle—shows at length that Jesus is the supreme High Priest, the Antitype of Aaron, not only for men in things pertaining to God, but also for God in things pertaining to men, the former and the latter being included in one sentence: A merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people.2 1 Hebrews 3:1; 2 Hebrews 2:17 THE GENERAL PRIESTLY FUNCTIONS The offering of the sacrifice by the Christian High Priest exhibits the unity and consummation of all the sacrificial elements in the ancient offering, as also of all the kinds and seasons of sacrifice, including the whole economy of the Levitical institute THE RITES OF SACRIFICE The Levitical sacrifice consisted of the presentation of a victim, with imposition of hands; the slaughtering, and sprinkling of the blood; the burning of the victim, and the sacrificial feast. These were not combined in every sacrifice; but they all belonged to the expiatory ceremonial, viewed as complete in itself and as hereafter to find its perfection in Christ, the Compendium of all oblations I. The PRESENTATION of the victim and LAYING ON OF HANDS were both the acts of the guilty offerer of the sacrifice

1. The place was the court of the sanctuary, whither the transgressor came indicating his desire to find his offended God in His holy dwelling-place. The victim was spotless, examined and approved as such: it was provided by the offerer himself, according to the prescription of the law, as the substitute of his own forfeited life. Its spotlessness was simply typical of the perfect sinlessness of the Lamb without blemish and without spot. 1 That Holy Victim offered Himself without spot to God, 2 being Himself the representative of the sinner who offered; but He was also delivered up for us all 3 by the Father, Who provided a sacrifice for the guilty race. The New Testament does not speak either of the Church or of the individual as providing an oblation. It is the prerogative of the Divine love to furnish sinful man with his sin-offering: as on that early typical mount it was said, God will provide Himself a lamb for a burnt-offering. 4 JEHOVAH-JIREH is the eternal law of the atonement between God and man 1 1 Peter 1:19; 2 Hebrews 9:14; 3 Romans 8:32; 4 Genesis 22:8

2. The imposition of hands was not so much symbolical of the transfer of sin or guilt as of submission to the Divine appointment and consequent dedication of the animal to be the medium of atonement. It was essentially therefore the deed of the delinquent, who not only touched but leaned on his victim: and he shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt-offering; and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him. 1 It was his act of faith in the ordinance of God; and has its fulfillment in the faith of the sinner who makes the death of Christ his own

1 Leviticus 1:4 II. THE SLAUGHTERING AND SPRINKLING OF THE BLOOD FOLLOWED: these being universal and always united

1. The Slaughtering, or shechiyt■ah had for its object the obtaining of the blood, to be presented to God for expiation: it was perhaps also the expression of a poena vicaria; though it was the offerer himself who slew the victim, and not the priest, except in the case of offerings for the nation. The victim was slain by the transgressor as the acknowledgment of his own desert of death. Our Lord laid down His life of Himself, and gave up His spirit voluntarily as a sacrifice; but by wicked hands He was crucified and slain. 1 The sinful world consummated its sin by slaying the sacrifice for its sin; its greatest iniquity was in that deed, but the Savior made 'His death His own act. He put away sin by THE SACRIFICE OF HIM-SELF. 2 Though it is only the apostates who crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, 3 yet every penitent believer presents the death of Christ as representing His own death; and the Church in the Holy Supper commemorates it as suffered for all 1 Acts 2:23; 2 Hebrews 9:26; 3 Hebrews 6:6

2 The priest alone sprinkled the blood, or applied it to the purpose of expiation, around the altar, first towards the curtain that concealed the mercy-seat, and then, in the highest expression of the symbolical act, on the Kapporeth or mercy-seat itself. For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul. 1 Two terms-are here observable, lakacot, to make atonement, is literally to cover: that is either the soul of the offerer as guilty, so that he is seen as under the pure life that on the altar screens him, or the condemning sentence of the covenant-testimony deposited beneath the mercy-seat Again, the blood maketh an atonement, kippur, by means of or in virtue of the soul in it.2 This is the true rendering; and it signifies that the innocent life which had been taken before the altar as the vicarious representative of the offerer is on the altar accepted of God representatively. Thus the sprinkling was the second or more effectual PRESENTATION without which the first was not perfect. The Redeemer's atonement was fully accomplished when His blood was shed; but it was not declared to be accepted until He presented it in the heavens: By His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption [for us]. 3 And He through the Eternal Spirit OFFERED HIMSELF without spot to God. The symbol of sprinkling is used with two applications; heavenward, for the propitiation of Divine displeasure; earthward, for the expiation of guilt. The sprinkling of the conscience signifies the application of the virtue of the expiation to the believer whose guilt is cancelled or negatived for the sake of Christ. Bat the term is sometimes varied in the evangelical use: occasionally it is the washing away of sin, or the purging of the conscience 1 Leviticus 17:11; 2 Leviticus 17:11; 3 Hebrews 9:12; Hebrews 9:24

III. THE SACRIFICAL IDEA WAS COMPLETED BY THE BURNING OF THE OFFERING AND THE SACRIFICIAL MEAL OR FEAST, which are closely united in their symbolical significance

1. The term used for burning is one that signifies to make to go up in vapor: the essence of the sacrifice ascends to God with acceptance. Therefore it could not directly symbolize the punishment of perdition: though as burning on the altar it was a symbol of the punitive justice as well as the sanctifying power of the Divine Spirit. The fire that consumed the offering, or parts of it, came from God: on that great first day of Levitical sacrifice there came a fire out from before the Lord, and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat: which when all the people saw, they shouted, and fell on their faces. 1 It was kept up continually by the morning and evening sacrifice: the fire shall ever be burning upon the altar; it shall never go out. 2 This signified that the entire service of sacrifice was to be well-pleasing for ever, from generation to generation, for His

sake Who hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savor. 3 Although the symbol had its highest fulfillment in the perfect self-surrender of Jesus, it had reference also to us and our oblation of ourselves The beneficiary of Christ's atonement must be sprinkled with His blood for the covering of his person as guilty; and he must yield himself with Christ as a whole burnt-offering made acceptable by the Holy Ghost: the one without the other can never avail. No less than this is meant by, I am crucified with Christ.4 1 Leviticus 9:24; 2 Leviticus 6:13; 3 Ephesians 5:2; 4 Galatians 2:20

2. Every sacrifice surrendered its life in its blood; some sacrifices were wholly destroyed; but in the peace-offering part was burnt and part reserved for a feast. This was the highest result of the ceremonial as expressing the communion between heaven and earth. In other sacrifices Jehovah received through the priests part of His portion: and what was burnt was also the bread of their God. 1 And the priest shall burn it upon the altar: it is the food of the offering made by fire unto the Lord. 2 St. Paul tells us that we are all partakers of that one bread. 3 The Lord's Supper is spread on the Lord's table: an altar to God, a table to us. Jesus is our great Peace-offering, as well as our Passover: and the highest expression of Christian faith in the evangelical sacrifice is thus to partake of the bread of their God, and sup with Him 1 Leviticus 21:6; 2 Leviticus 3:11; 3 1 Corinthians 10:17 THE VARIOUS OFFERINGS The various sacrifices themselves may be blended into unity. They were divided anciently into burnt-offerings, peace-offerings, and bloodless gifts: to these were added, in the Levitical economy, sin and trespass offerings. All oblations of every kind were under the jurisdiction of the high priest, and were consummated and summed up in the one sacrifice of Christ

I. The primitive sacrifices, which prefigured the Atonement long before the Levitical service, and corresponded therefore to the Gospel before the Law, are to be traced up to the earliest times, even to the very gate of Paradise

1. The origin of sacrifice is not matter of express revelation. But the almost universal prevalence of oblations, bloody and unbloody, indicates its Divine appointment. The primitive record in Genesis is as dim in its utterance on this subject as it is upon sin generally and the atoning Redeemer. We read of sacrifices offered by Cain and Abel: by the former unbloody gifts, by the latter slain victims. The Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering: but unto Cain and to his offering He had not respect. 1 The reason of the difference lay in the disposition of the offerers. By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain: 2 his offering was a gift, but it was also an expiatory typical sacrifice, which Cain's was not. And there can be little doubt that the faith which rendered that primitive oblation acceptable was faith in the Great Sacrifice of the future

Thus the first account of approach to the Supreme by sacrificial offerings teaches, when interpreted by the New Testament, that it was not enough to draw nigh with gifts betokening gratitude and self-surrender; but that every oblation of thanksgiving must needs have in it a propitiatory element. This primitive oblation therefore gave the law for all subsequent worship as culminating after long and various developments in the Christian atonement 1 Genesis 4:4-5; 2 Hebrews 11:4

2. The BURNT-OFFERING, laolaah, was the earliest, most common, and most comprehensive of the oblations dedicated to Heaven as Korban or Gift. Its pre-eminence was its symbolical meaning, that combined in one the expiatory shedding of blood and the perfect offering of the self:

hence it underlay, surrounded, and perfected all other oblations from the beginning of sacrificial communion with God down to the Perfect Sacrifice. It was this which Noah presented at the second beginning of propitiatory oblations. He offered burnt-offerings on the altar. And the Lard smelled a sweet savor; and the Lord said in His heart, I will not again curse the ground. 1 Jehovah accepted the expiation of the Patriarch; and smelled afar off the sweet savor of the Perfect Sacrifice for the guilty world. Abraham was commanded to take his only son Isaac into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt-offering: 2 the type of the same far distant oblation of the Only-begotten. The covenant of Sinai was ratified by burnt-offerings.3 They pervaded also the subsequent Levitical economy, constituted the daily or continual sacrifice which typified the eternal atonement, and always maintained their preeminence The double character assigned to them is stated at the outset of Leviticus. And he shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt-offering; and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him 4 After the sprinkling of the blood fire was put upon the altar, the wood laid in order, and it became an offering made by fire, of a sweet savor unto the Lord. This twofold character further gives it special significance as it respects the Supreme Antitype and His people. Christ also hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for an odor of a sweet smell. 5 Here the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ is the freewill burnt-offering of His perfect love. And in that it is the example of the offering of His people: as the sin-offering proper He does not admit us so directly to share or continue or fill up His sacrifice 1 Genesis 8:20-21; 2 Genesis 22:2; Genesis 22:7; 3 Exodus 24:8; 4 Leviticus 1:4; Leviticus 1:9; 5 Ephesians 5:2

3. The PEACE-OFFERINGS—whether thank-offerings, vows, or freewill gifts—were combinations of expiatory and dedicatory sacrifice: but they represented the gifts of the offerer rather than himself the giver. Like the burnt-offering they signified at once the consciousness of sin and the thankfulness for deliverance from it. They were presented, so far as they were expiatory, for the re-establishment of a state of grace; and, that being accomplished, as the joyful expression also of acceptance with God. These all found their antitype in the Paschal Lamb: He is our Peace, 1 Whose oblation we present in faith for the forgiveness of sins, and receive sacramentally as the pledge of that forgiveness. It may be added that the meat-offerings and drink-offerings which were connected with the daily burnt sacrifice, as also with the other peace-offerings, belong to the general idea of Divine acceptance and communion with the worshippers. Our present purpose does not require a minute investigation of them. Suffice that they in some sense mitigated the sternness of the ancient institute; and that they all find their end and perfection in the Christian Supper 1 Ephesians 2:14

II. Peculiar to the Levitical economy were the SIN-OFFERINGS, and their modification, the TRESPASS-OFFERINGS. These were intimately connected with the giving of the law, as containing the more express revelation of the nature of sin, and as the basis of a preparatory covenant of typical sacrifice for its expiation. We have here chiefly to do with these offerings, including their more stern and their more joyful accompaniments, as the preeminent type or prophetic symbolical foreshadowing of the Christian Atonement

1. It is impossible to formulate with precision the difference between the sin-offering and the guilt-offering in the Levitical institute. Both were expiatory sacrifices for SIN, as being offence against positive law and ceremonial ordinances, committed in ignorance and inadvertence; that is, not with a high hand and in deliberate rebellion. But the trespass-offering was always presented

for individual error: the sin-offering not always The former respected violation of the rights of the covenant, the latter rather neglect of its precepts. Hence the former had more to do with transgressions touching property, the latter with transgressions of law. The trespass-offering connoted the idea of SATISFACTION: and he shall bring his guilt-offering to the Lord, a ram without blemish out of the flock, according to thy estimation, for a guilt-offering, unto the priest; and the priest shall make atonement for him before the Lord, and it shall be forgiven him. 1 The sin-offering connoted rather the idea of EXPIATION through the sacrifice of a pure life. But in the supreme and universal oblation of Christ the distinction is done away for ever. He is at once the Satisfaction of every Divine claim, and the Propitiation for every human offence 1 Leviticus 6:6-7

2. The sin-offering, of which the guilt-offering was only a species, brought into distinct prominence the expiatory character of the sacrificial institute, which, before the giving of the law, was to a certain extent veiled and hidden. It was from the beginning itself called SIN, chataat, LXX. amartia, peri ths amartias, for sin; even as the guilt-offering was itself called GUILT, ASM. Hence our Lord is said to have been made sin for us, Who knew no sin, 1 and, at His second coming, will appear without sin unto salvation. 2 The sacrifice was, so to speak, the embodiment or incarnation of sin; and, where the offering made atonement for all the people, the flesh was burned without the camp. 3 No sin offering, whereof any of the blood is brought into the tabernacle of the congregation to reconcile withal in the holy place, shall be eaten. 4 But in the lower and more individual grades of the sin-offering there was a marked difference. In the place where the burnt offering is killed shall the sin offering be killed before the Lord: IT IS MOST HOLY. The priest that offereth it for sin shall eat it: 5 though not the transgressor himself. It might seem that when the flesh was eaten by the priests their official sanctity neutralized the impurity of the victim. Our Great High Priest was MOST HOLY though bearing the sins of the world; and, though He represented the sin-offering that must not be eaten, He was nevertheless the Offering of which we all partake as priestly offerers. And the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all. 6 This gives the idea both of expiation and of substitution. His soul was made an offering for sin. Jesus was the reality of that which the sin-offerings only typified. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year: 7 a remembrance made, not only every year, but on every occasion of their presentation. They only taught the evil of sin and the need of atonement: there could be nothing homogeneous between an animal victims and a human transgressor. They accustomed the people to the thought of a SUBSTITUTE; but we, in the Fulfillment, see that the Supreme SIN-OFFERING has expiated sin itself, and not merely offence against the Levitical institute; that He is the atonement even for those offences with a high hand of whose perpetrator it was said: that soul shall he utterly cut off; his iniquity shall be upon him.8 In Him is all the virtue, and none of the defect, of the ancient types

1 2 Corinthians 5:21; 2 Hebrews 9:28; 3 Hebrews 13:11; 4 Leviticus 6:30; 5 Leviticus 6:25-26; 6 Isaiah 53:6; Isaiah 53:10; 7 Hebrews 10:3; 8 Numbers 15:31

3. The distinction between two kinds of sin-offering, one for the whole congregation, the other for individual transgressions, must be constantly borne in mind

(1.) The latter had less direct relation to the Christian Sacrifice: being designed to make atonement for offences against the Theocratic code not willfully committed but through ignorance or rashness or levity. This qualification perpetually occurs as restricting the efficacy of these offerings for sin. If any one of the common people sin through ignorance, bishgaagaah, while he doeth somewhat

against any of the commandments of the Lord concerning things which ought not to be done, and be guilty; or if his sin, which he hath sinned, come to his knowledge, then he shall bring his offering . . .. And the priest shall make an atonement for him, and it shall be forgiven him. 1 Here it is to be observed that the Hebrew word used signifies transgression or ERRING through the predominance of the evil principle within, in contradistinction to sinning presumptuously or with a high hand, 2 b^{a}yaad raamaah. For the latter, class there was no sin-offering. Hence the Psalmist's prayer: Who can understand his errors? cleanse Thou me from secret faults Keep back Thy servant also from presumptuous sins. 3 For the former there was cleansing; from the latter the petitioner sought only restraint. And in the Epistle to the Hebrews it is said that the high priest offered for the errors of the people, 4 for their agnoeemátoon, and not for their willful violations of the covenant. Herein the type fell immeasurably below the Antitype. The expiation of Christ avails for every sin that is confessed over the Atonement: if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous: 5 and He is the propitiation for our sins. Yet the severity of the restriction in the type is also pressed into the service of Christian caution. Though the Great Sacrifice avails for all sin, there is no atonement for the obstinate rejector of that sacrifice. If we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins. 6 As there were sins unatoned for in the Theocracy, so also there is a sin unto death 7 under the Gospel 1 Leviticus 4:27-31; 2 Numbers 15:30; 3 Psalms 19:12-13; 4 Hebrews 9:7; 5 1 John 2:1-2; 6 Hebrews 10:26; 7 1 John 5:16

(2.) The daily and annual sacrifices for the sin of the people covered the guilt of all the congregation as such, and availed, on behalf of all who put their trust in the Divine ordinance, for the expiation of every kind of offence not already punished by excision The blood of these was sprinkled before the Lord towards the Holiest, and upon the horns of the altar of sweet incense; 1 on the great day of atonement upon the mercy-seat. 2 But of this more hereafter 1 Leviticus 4:6-17; 2 Leviticus 16:16

4. The sin-offerings of the Levitical economy had sometimes connected with them certain peculiar Purifications of the individual and of the community, regarded as having contracted defilement: leprosy; contact with dead bodies; suspected crimes, such as adultery and murder; the blood guiltiness of the community when the manslayer was not discovered. The diversified ceremonies superadded to the sacrifice which generally accompanied them pertained to what the New Testament terms the purifying of the flesh.1 They had mainly to do with the Theocratic relations of the parties; but were all typical of the defilement of sin, and are often referred to as illustrations of the purifying effect of the Atonement. They have done much to mould the phraseology of the Christian covenant; but of themselves belong rather to the archaeology of the ancient people

1 Hebrews 9:13

III. The Redeemer of mankind represented in Himself every expiatory offering of every kind, and in His one oblation offered once all other oblations have found their end and spiritual perfection. He is the One Sacrifice for sin presented by Himself, the High Priest, for and on behalf of mankind represented by Him. He is the VICTIMA SACERDOTII SUI ET SACERDOS SUAE VICTIMAE. As, in the Epistle to the Romans, He is the end of the law for righteousness, 1 so, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, He is the end of the sacrifices for eternal redemption. 2 But here two important cautionary suggestions must be made 1 Romans 10:4; 2 Hebrews 9:12

1. The entire system of ancient sacrifices was but the shadow of an eternal substance. The Epistle which gives us the authentic valuation of the old economy tells us that it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins; 1 that the law could not make the comers thereunto perfect 2 in freedom from the conscience of sins. They sanctified only to the purifying of the flesh. 3 On the one hand, they availed only for the maintenance of a national and individual relation to the Theocracy. On the other, they made no provision for deliverance from guilt as violation of the moral law. The true secret of the peace which was pronounced upon penitent and sincere offerings was reserved: to be made known when the figure for the time then present 4 should be superseded by the Reality. And, with regard to this, the sincere Hebrew and the sincere Gentile were on a level: only that the former had the revelation that constantly announced a future Redeemer, and might mingle with his merely carnal ordinances a dim faith in the yet unrevealed Atonement 1 Hebrews 10:4; 2 Hebrews 10:1; 3 Hebrews 9:13; 4 Hebrews 9:9

2. But, this being true, the figurative and typical institute gave profound suggestion of the nature of that future propitiation. It told of the exceeding sinfulness of sin, which in its endless varieties was so rigorously watched by the Holy One of Israel, and demanded such varieties of sacrifice. The meaning of the sacrificial phraseology must not be lost when it is transferred to Christian times, as many vainly affirm: that meaning is glorified in the spirit, but its body and its letter is still of Christ. Patterns only, they were still patterns of things in the heavens. 1 Many terms are given to oblivion in the Gospel; but EXPIATION as the ground of REMISSION through the shedding of SACRIFICIAL BLOOD are words to be had in everlasting remembrance. If the economy of typical propitiations had no permanent significance, but introduced a system in which no atonement was offered to justice, the New-Testament Epistles must have been written in a totally different style

1 Hebrews 9:23 THE SACRIFICIAL SEASONS The various holy seasons and festivals of the old covenant were also summed up and abolished in the one High-priestly function of Christ. There were the Daily Service; the Sabbatic Days; the Three Feasts, and the Great Fast. In the year there may be said to have been two main cycles: the Passover, with the days of Unleavened Bread, and the Feast of Weeks or Pentecost for the spring; the Day of Atonement, the Feast of Tabernacles, with its Azereth for the autumn. All these were under the supervision and control of the high priest; and they were all done away by being glorified in the mission and work of the Redeemer. The Passover and the Day of Atonement will for our purpose adequately represent the entire series THE PASSOVER The Passover was at once a sacrifice for sin and a peace-offering. Unless we admit this combination we miss the design of the institute and lose its profound connection with the Christian Sacrifice

1. The Angel of the Lord passed over or spared all the houses which were sprinkled with the blood of the paschal lamb; but sprinkling generally, at least sprinkling with blood, connoted the idea of expiation. The representative of the household confessed that deliverance was of the grace of God alone; and the people as a whole at the beginning of every ecclesiastical year renewed the covenant with God by sacrifice. As a sin-offering it was also a peace-offering: celebrating as a national expression of gratitude the redemption from Egypt as well as the deliverance of Israel’s firstborn. Subordinate to this was its acknowledgment of the goodness of Jehovah in the gifts of the earth. The slaying of the victim and the partaking of it went together from year to year, and from generation to generation: hence the Passover was a sin offering and a peace-offering in one

2. Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us: therefore let us keep the feast. 1 These words, though standing alone in this form, must be understood according to their plain import as throwing a flood of light on the ancient institute and on its spiritual significance. In virtue of the blood of Jesus the spiritual Israel are redeemed from worse than Egyptian bondage and blessed with a better inheritance than Canaan. In the first reference to the Lord's sacrifice the Baptist termed Him the Lamb of God, Which taketh away the sin of the world, 2 where it is certainly the paschal lamb that is referred to, but with the expiatory and substitutionary idea of later prophecy added and made prominent. The Lord's own constant reference to the sacrificial and sacramental food of His flesh would seem to imply the presence in His thoughts of the paschal feast, which indeed was the main characteristic of the Passover. It was a communion, and in this different from every other sacrifice: not a feast in which the offerer partook with the priest, but one in which the families of Israel united. At the close of His life the Redeemer instituted the Eucharist, as the Evangelical Passover, in which His Church should for ever keep the feast: first, as a commemorative Sacrifice, celebrating the expiatory death; secondly, as a symbolical Sacrament, representing Christ, the Passover, as the nourishment of His people; and, thirdly, as an emblem of the unity of His New Israel in Himself 1 1 Corinthians 5:7-8; 2 John 1:29

3. The Passover was prolonged for seven days to give the feast the covenant character of perfection: the seven days were the FEAST OF UNLEAVENED BREAD which gave it its name On the first day after the proper Passover was the offering of the wave-sheaf. Seven full weeks after that wave-offering came the FEAST OF WEEKS, the celebration of the completed harvest: hereafter to be abolished and glorified in the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day which was known as the Pentecost. With this feast the fulfillment of the Old-Testament paschal festival was complete. The characteristic of the whole solemnity was the festal commemoration of deliverance from Egypt; a deliverance which typified the Great Redemption. And its connection with the Eucharist, the abiding sacramental commemoration in the Christian Church, makes the Passover in a certain sense the preeminent typical institute of the Old Testament. The Lord's Supper is, so to speak, the antitype of the Paschal Feast as it included the whole cycle of seven weeks: it therefore is the Christian Feast which celebrates all the events of the Fifty Days THE DAY OF ATONEMENT The Day of Atonement, on the tenth of Tisri, the seventh month, effected an annual reconciliation between God and the collective people; and was the chief, inasmuch as it was the most comprehensive, typical and symbolical Old-Testament prefiguration of the Christian mystery. As such it combined most of the other elements of the sacrificial economy, and added not a few of its own. It was the day of the high priest pre-eminently, when his function culminated. On other days acting by delegates, on that day—THE DAY, Bªyowm, of the Talmud—he administered his office almost alone: the sublimest of all typical figures

1. The sacrifices he first offered for himself showed the distinction between the type and the Antitype: as the representative of the people, and also one of them, he needed atonement for himself and his priestly order and the very sanctuary that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness. 1 The holy places however were purified by the sprinkling of the blood of the victims offered for priest and people, probably mingled, and not by any distinct sacrifices ordained for that purpose: their unclean ness resulted from the sins of those who entered them 1 Leviticus 16:16

2. The high priest's typical relation to Christ was shown in his transaction with the two goats respectively. 1 One, chosen by lot, he offered for a sin-offering. Its blood availed for universal expiation: for all the transgressions of all the people, as sprinkled upon the mercy-seat seven times; for the altar and sanctuary without as sprinkled also upon them The counterpart victim, the Scapegoat, was the symbolical BEARER AWAY of the iniquities which the other goat BORE. Upon its head the high priest confessed all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions according to all their sins, and it was driven forth unto a land not inhabited:2 into a separated land, 'erets gªzeeraah, symbol of that utter separation from God which is the punishment of sin. Though the two goats were distinct, they made up one expiatory idea. The victim which was slain represented the sacrifice for sin and the remission of penalty. The victim which was not slain, but driven into the desert to die, symbolized the absolute removal and Divine oblivion of guilt: la`ªzaa'zeel, TO AZAZEL, or for the Scapegoat, means literally to utter forgetfulness or complete dismissal. The double symbol declared that all penalty was remitted and all sin forgiven and forgotten: cancelled as though it were not 1 Leviticus 16:8-34; 2 Leviticus 16:21-22

3. But that which made this the Supreme Solemnity of the Levitical economy was the fact that then only was the blood of expiation, of which Jehovah said, I have GIVEN IT TO YOU upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls, 1 brought within the veil, into the very presence of God where the law within the ark testified against the transgressors

Then were all the other forgivenesses of the year confirmed; then all defects in forgiveness repaired, saving only as touching those high-handed acts of rebellion which found no place of repentance. The assurance was that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord. 2 Hence in the Great Fulfillment the Christian High Priest hath entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us. 3 But the typical high priest went out again from the face of Jehovah. The process of expiation must be repeated annually. Jesus needs not to offer Himself often: His one oblation covers the whole sphere of human sin from the beginning to the end of its continuance on earth. And His abiding within the Veil is our security 1 Leviticus 17:11; 2 Leviticus 16:30; 3 Hebrews 9:24-25 THE PASSOVER AND DAY OF ATONEMENT COMBINED The entire doctrine of the Atonement is based upon the Christian fulfillment of the prophetic and typical meaning of these two solemnities, the Paschal Feast and the Atoning Fast. A combination of their elements is necessary. Neither is sufficient of itself But, united, they furnish a most impressive and comprehensive view of the central Christian mystery

1. As the Passover predominates in the Gospels, so the Day of Atonement takes the lead in the later New Testament, especially in the Epistles to the Romans 1:1-32 and the Hebrews, neither of which alludes to the paschal solemnity. The former points every allusion to the subject with a reference to the great Fast day: it makes Christ Himself the propitiatory, or mercy-seat, or propitiation, set forth in the mind of God and upon the scene of transgression, for the remission of human sins in the past and the present and the future: while it does not exclude the intercession of Christ, it dwells rather on the offering in the outer court. Moreover, it connects the whole rather with the idea of righteousness than with the idea of sanctification: combining in one the evangelical court and the evangelical temple. In the Epistle to the Hebrews 2:1-18 the great day of expiation occupies a very large place. The sacrifice in the outer court and the presentation within the veil fill up the central chapters of the treatise 1 Romans 3:21-28; 2 Hebrews 9:1-28; Hebrews 10:1-39

2. As united they demonstrate typically what the Christian atonement demonstrates really, the absolute necessity of satisfaction to Divine justice in order that the Divine love may be glorified; that therefore the God who is offended Himself provided the Supreme Sacrifice; that the virtue of the atonement, apprehended by faith, secures the perfect abolition or canceling of sin and its punishment; that the one Redeemer Who offered His life on the altar of the cross ever liveth to present His intercession for His people on earth

3. They further teach in their unity that the benefit of the supreme expiation belongs to the company of Christ's people as such. That is the general lesson taught by the types of the Levitical economy. If we would seek the universal effect and influence of the redeeming Sacrifice we must go behind and beyond the Mosaic institute, to the primary sacrificial oblations which were before the Law. There we find Him in Whom should all the nations of the earth be blessed.1

1 Genesis 22:18

4. When combined they also proclaim that the redeemed estate of the people of God, the children of redemption and of the sacrificial covenant, is one of mingled fasting and feasting. If the Passover was the Great Feast, the Day of Atonement was the Great Fast: but they are united in the Cross and its commemoration. In other words, there is a foreshadowing of the truth that stamps its solemn impress on the writings of the Apostle Paul: the Christian life is a union with Christ in His suffering and in His joy, in His life and in His death, in the process and in the result of His atonement. The joy, however, predominates; for He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; 1 borne them away into the land of forgetfulness. The Day of Atonement has no sacramental commemoration as such: Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us; let us keep the Feast.2 1 Isaiah 53:4; 2 1 Corinthians 5:7-8 INTERCESSION AND BENEDICTION

It was the preeminent function of the high priest to present the blood of atonement, and thus silently to intercede for the whole congregation once in the year; though the priestly service generally was one of perpetual mediation and intercession. The Blessing of the people was also the special office of the priests, to be discharged after and on the ground of the sacrificial offerings. Our Lord's Intercession is the presentation of Himself in heaven to the Father after His self-oblation on earth; not without special prayer for its objects. His Benediction is imparted by the Holy Ghost, and is bound up with the administration of all the blessings of the new covenant. While Intercession is more directly connected with the sacrificial office, Benediction is linked with all the offices of the Christ. It is the final consummation of each

INTERCESSION

I. The intercession of the high priest was expressed typically by the incense before the mercy seat in the Holiest on the day of atonement. David says generally: Let my prayer be set forth before Thee as incense; 1 and in the New Testament we read generally again of the golden bowls full of incense, which are the prayers of saints. 2 But the incense offered by the high priest was strictly connected with his typical mediatorial relation: 3 And Moses said unto Aaron, Take a censer, and put fire therein from off the altar, and put on incense, and go quickly unto the congregation, and make an atonement for them. 4 Moses himself, without the incense, had interceded in words. This was an extraordinary, and, as it were, irregular procedure; and is the solitary instance of the incense representing the atonement. The prayer of Moses and the censer of Aaron alike typified

the intercession of Christ, Who intercedes both by the presentation of His sacrifice and by the virtue of His prayer. At first the high priest himself burnt sweet incense every morning as also at even . . . a perpetual incense before the Lord on the altar for that purpose which was before the veil that is by the ark of the testimony. 5 Hence we read in the Epistle to the Hebrews of the Holiest of all, which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant. 6 This discrepancy is to be explained by the fact of the intimate, connection between the two. The daily incense was the symbol of the intercession that daily allayed the Divine displeasure; but it was on the day of atonement that this symbol had its highest meaning. That the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy seat that is upon the testimony, that he die not: 7 these last words belonged to the type only, but the general truth remains that the incense of intercession covered the mercy seat simultaneously with the blood of atonement, and blended with the thick cloud of the Divine glory. So the mystical temple of the Prophet's vocation was fitted with smoke: 8 the smoke of the same intercessory incense which fills the temple where Jesus the High Priest presents His eternal sacrifice

1 Psalms 141:2; 2 Revelation 5:8; 3 Numbers 16:46; 4 Exodus 32:11; Exodus 32:32; 5 Exodus 30:6-8; 6 Hebrews 9:3-4; 7 Leviticus 16:13; 8 Isaiah 6:4

II. This antitypical intercession of Christ is variously set forth in the New Testament, especially in the Temple Epistle

1. It is the presentation of HIMSELF before the Father on our behalf. By His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption: 1 ONCE FOR ALL. He is not represented as carrying His atoning blood with Him: the exhibition of His Sacred Person is enough. A careful consideration of the classical passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews will shed much light upon this. The English Authorized Version mentions three appearances of Christ as marking the historical process of the Atonement. The three terms in the original are different and carefully chosen: the middle one expressing the fact that the Son of God in our humanity manifests Himself before His Father and our Father without a veil. At the end of the ages He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself: 2 pefanérootai, was manifested as God in the flesh. This is closely, indeed indistinguishably, connected with His entering into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us: emfanistheénai, to present Himself boldly and abidingly without any protecting cloud of incense. This silent intercessory appearance shall end when He will appear a second time without sin unto salvation: oftheésetai, He will be seen of angels and men in His majesty, without the humiliation of His sacrificial connection with sin. St. John expresses the same truth : If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous; and He is the propitiation for our sins.3 He is Himself the Propitiation and the Advocate: Himself, which is more than His blood or His life. The virtue of His sacrifice is the value of His Person. The MERIT of Christ is the power of His intercession; and that merit is not simply the fact of His voluntary selfsacrifice, but His self-sacrifice as that of the Son of the Father's infinite complacency. His merit is the worthiness of His Incarnate Self. His Presence in heaven is His all-effectual plea. Three important truths arise here to our notice. (1.) The intercessory presentation of Himself in heaven is not, as the Socinians and those who follow them assert, the beginning of His priestly function. Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many:4 hápax prosenechtheís eis tó polloón anenengkeín hamartías, sacrificial terms which had their full meaning already in the Cross. (2.) There is, however, no continuation of the sacrifice in heaven; and there can be no continuation of it

upon earth. The Atonement is gone up FOR A MEMORIAL BEFORE GOD 5 for ever; and the Romanist Sacrifice of the Mass has no sanction, but is utterly condemned, in the Epistle to the Hebrews. As it is appointed unto men once to die 6 for their sins, so Christ was in the deepest truth APPOINTED TO DIE ONCE for expiation of sins, but only once. (3.) Lastly, the unity of the Atonement on earth and the intercession based upon it in heaven must be most carefully maintained. The NOW to appear marks the whole period from Calvary to the Judgment as the Day of Grace, and of the PUTTING AWAY OF SIN, the athéteesin teés hamartías. 7

1 Hebrews 9:12; 2 Hebrews 9:24-28; 3 1 John 2:1; 4 Hebrews 9:28; 5 Acts 10:4; 6 Hebrews 9:27; 7 Hebrews 9:24; Hebrews 9:26

2. The intercession of our Lord is also direct supplication on behalf of its beneficiaries: the words which describe it prove this. He maketh intercession 1 for us: the term entungchánei generally used of oral supplication either for or against its objects. And Jesus Christ the Righteous 2 is called our parákleeton with the Father, our Advocatus or Intercessor, fulfilling His promise that He would pray the Father 3 for His disciples, and thus continuing in heaven the High-priestly prayer begun on earth. As to the speech of the glorified Son Incarnate, the tongue not of men nor of angels, the unspeakable words which it is not yet lawful either to hear or to utter, it is needless to inquire. Suffice that the Saviour's intercession has all the effect of what below is called intercessory prayer As we must not refine away the truth of His being touched with the feeling of our infirmities, 4 so we must not make the God-man above a Silent Representative of our humanity 1 Romans 8:27; 2 1 John 2:1; 3 John 14:16; 4 Hebrews 4:15

III. The objects of His intercession are the world, the mystical Church of His people, and every individual who appeals to Him

1. By His presence in heaven Christ is the Pleader for the world, that is for the humanity, human kind, or human nature, which He represents. The high priest entered into the inmost sanctuary of the temple on behalf of the covenant people: the blood which he sprinkled was accompanied by incense, which he waved, without a word, not to protect himself from the insufferable glory of God, already dimmed by the thick darkness 1 of the cloud, but to prevent the Divine justice from causing his death as the representative of the people. This incense signified the intercession of Christ, whose presence in heaven keeps the sinful earth in being; I bear up the pillars of it. 2 It availed from the beginning by anticipation; on no ground can we understand how a guilty race should be propagated under the moral government of God save that the intercession of the Second Adam began when first it was said: the plague is begun. Hence Isaiah, going beyond the Levitical economy, says that He made intercession for the transgressors: 3 this in the widest meaning of the word 1 Psalms 75:3; 2 Numbers 16:46; 3 Isaiah 53:12

2. It is true, however, that the specific intercession of Christ is limited to His prayer for His own people. Before He departed He poured out an intercessory supplication which was the earnest and the type and the pledge of His future pleading for His Church as united by faith with its Living Head

(1.) This intercession is only for His own: not because the Redeemer forgets the world which He came to save, but because it is of a character distinct, and appropriate only to His people's relation to Him. It is not only request on their behalf, but the sacred demand of Christ on behalf of Himself

as represented in His people. They are His other Self, YET NOT ANOTHER. Father, I will that they also, whom Thou hast given Me, be with Me where 1Amos 1:1-15 It is rather stipulation than intercession: théloo rather than eroto. Hence Jesus, because He continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore He is able to save them to the uttermost (or perfectly and evermore) that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them. 2 He hath brought them to God, but also brought them to Himself; and only asks the portion that falleth to Him. He demands rather than asks for them, as united with Himself and part of Himself, all that is His: that the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them, and I in them. 3 The Father's love is arrogated for them as of necessity, because the Beloved Son of the Father is in them both collectively and individually 1 John 17:24; 2 Hebrews 7:24-25; 3 John 17:26

(2.) The Saviour's intercession as High Priest makes acceptable both the persons and the worship of His people. Grace is given freely in the Beloved. 1 They offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. 2 His is the much incense, that He should add it unto the prayers of all saints: 3 the angel to whom it was given was only a ministering priest or Levite under this great High Priest. And in order that all the service of those who are priests with Christ may be well pleasing, the Holy Ghost represents the Supreme Intercessor within their hearts. The Spirit Himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. 4 And He that searcheth the Hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, for He maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God according to the will of the High Priest also. There is no more impressive view of the heavenly pleading within the veil than that which makes the voice of the Holy Ghost within our hearts its echo. This concert of the Two Intercessors—the One within the shrine above, the other within the shrine of our spirits, but both agreeing in one—is the infallible guarantee of our communion with God and acceptable prayer 1 Ephesians 1:6; 2 1 Peter 2:5; 3 Revelation 8:3; 4 Romans 8:26-27

(3.) This intercessory pleading is the Scriptural expression for that perfect sympathy of our Lord with His members on earth which His community of nature gives Him, in virtue of which He is their Paraclete or Advocate or Helper, succoring them in temptation, strengthening them for duty, and imparting to them seasonable help. He knows the secrets of all hearts as God: but His humanity gives Him a knowledge that He could not without it have, and the Scripture lays much stress on the benefit of this. Wherefore in all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren . . .. For in that He Himself hath suffered being tempted, He is able to succor them that are tempted. 1 His sympathy does not spring from remembrance of sin or fall or danger of falling; but from His human experience of the devices of Satan haunting the accesses of our nature. In His atoning passion He Who knew no sin yet became acquainted with it as only God incarnate could become; so also in His administration of His atoning grace He knows, as only God incarnate can know, our need 1 Hebrews 2:17-18

3. But this leads to the individual bearing of our Saviour's intercession. The Head of every man is Christ: 1 the High Priest over the whole house has a special relation to every worshipper. He is the Representative of the whole Church, and of every several branch, in His intercession: it was the Church of Laodicaea, neither hot nor cold, concerning which He said, I will spue thee out of My mouth, 2 or drop its name from His heavenly Litany. But His heart is also the faithful Friend of sinners, and faithful to every mortal transgressor as his own High Priest. As surely as the Atonement availed for the entire family of Adam, so certainly the pleading of Christ on the ground

of the atonement may be appealed to by every representative of that family 1 1 Corinthians 11:3; 2 Revelation 3:16

(1.) This is the strength of the penitent's heart in approaching the God of justice. The one Mediator between God and men 1 makes intercession for all that come unto God by Him For through Him we both2—Jews and Gentiles, saved and unsaved—have access by one Spirit unto the Father. 3 Every man living and sinning on earth has, if he will only use it, an introduction, prosagoogeén, a right of humble approach to God. He has not only the ground of confidence that an accepted propitiation for his race gives, but also the assurance of a Divine-HUMAN Representative who loves his own individual soul, and has left on record this unrevoked and irrevocable word: him that cometh to Me I will in no wise cast out. 4 If He will not cast him out, most surely the Father behind Him will not 1 1 Timothy 2:5; 2 Hebrews 7:25; 3 Ephesians 2:18; 4 John 6:37

(2.) Especially is this true of the believer. On the basis of the Atonement he is accepted in Christ; but he might be tempted to think, nor would it be an unreasonable temptation, that, having sinned against the grace of that Atonement, his hope must perish. But his Head above is a living, unchangeable, ever available Pleader for him. If any man—any Christian man—sin, we have an Advocate, 1 Who, in the court of heaven, vindicates the rights of His sacrifice offered on earth. For every believer He is at once a Propitiation and a Paraclete in the presence of the Father

1 1 John 2:1

BENEDICTION

1. The solemn Benediction which attested Divine acceptance was expressly provided for in the Levitical service. It was an integral part of the high priest's duty, which, like almost all others, was committed in due time to the priesthood generally. At the first consecration of Aaron and his sons, after the offerings were presented for the host, Aaron lifted up his hand toward the people, and blessed them.... and the glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people. 1 The evidence of that verbal blessing was that there came a fire out from before the Lord, and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat: which when all the people saw, they shouted, and fell on their faces. Of the priests the sons of Levi 2 it was afterwards said, that them the Lord thy God hath chosen to minister unto Him, and to bless IN THE NAME OF THE LORD. The stress must be laid upon these last words: God alone is to be blessed in Doxology, and God alone blesses in Benediction, whether in Old Testament or New. The blessing was not only, however, in the name of the Lord; it was also the name of the Triune God Jehovah impressed upon the people, making them His own. Speak unto Aaron and unto his sons, saying, On this wise ye shall bless the children of Israel, saying unto them, The Lord bless thee, and keep thee: the Lord make His face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: the Lord lift up His countenance upon thee, and give thee peace. And they shall put MY NAME upon the children of Israel; and I will bless them. 3 Here are united the blessings of universal providential care, of mercy for sin, and of internal peace: for the people generally and for every individual worshipper prepared to receive it. Two things are to be observed in passing 1 Leviticus 9:22-24; 2 Deuteronomy 21:5; 3 Numbers 6:23-27

1. As we have seen that the symbols of sacrifice within the veil pointed mysteriously but certainly to the Triune God, so also did the Benediction which sealed to the worshippers the acceptance of those sacrifices. Three names, yet to be revealed, are alone wanting to make the Levitical

Blessing the distinct benediction of the Holy Trinity. The benediction IN ACT, the effusion of the Divine glory, found its great realization, though itself a reality, when God shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of [Jesus] Christ. 1 His is the Face of God turned on the penitent in GRACE, whether in this world or the next. The benediction IN WORD found its highest fulfillment in the testimony of the Divine Spirit, giving PEACE through the assurance that we have grace freely bestowed on us in the Beloved.2 1 2 Corinthians 4:6; 2 Ephesians 1:6

2. The ancient Benediction was not only typical; it was more than a mere form of words; it was a reality, pronouncing over the people, and every individual who sincerely complied with the conditions of the old covenant, an acceptance the true and eternal ground of which was as yet not made known. It has already been seen that the Levitical economy, as such and in its specific prescriptions for the atonement of individual and national offences, aimed only at the maintenance of external legal relations to the Theocracy. But, underlying and surrounding all these, was the great typical system of sacrifice that was accepted for the sake of the Coming Atonement, the undisputed virtue of which secured the effectual acceptance of God. There was a pretermission or páresin of all sins for a season, until the fullness of time confirmed this into an aphesis, 1 or full forgiveness

1 Romans 3:25

II. It is the prerogative of the One Mediator between God and man that He is not only the Minister of blessing, but that He is also its Source. 1 He is God and the High Priest in one

He is the Antitype of Melchisedec, who met Abraham, higher than he, and blessed him and all the Levitical priesthood in him. The benediction of Jesus is the benediction of God Incarnate, and it is no less than the administration of all the benefits of the evangelical covenant: the promise of eternal inheritance.2 1 Hebrews 7:1-11; 2 Hebrews 9:15

1. The blessing of our High Priest is deliverance from sin. It is the blessing of Abraham,1 that is, the righteousness of faith, 2 and the promise of the Spirit through faith: that Spirit being the sanctifying power of the Gospel. God, having raised up His Servant sent Him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities. 3 Comparing these passages, which are one in the unity of the blessing of Abraham, we gather that the Christian High-priestly benediction is our deliverance from all sin 1 Galatians 3:9-14; 2 Romans 4:13; 3 Acts 3:26

2. Hence it is the impartation of all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ. 1 The term BLESSING is one that cannot be defined: it is the gracious mystery of the manifestation of the Supreme to His people in grace. It is a gift without a definition; including all the individual benefits that may be put into words, it surpasses each in particular and surrounds the whole. It is the unbounded sum of all that has been procured for the redeemed children of men: first, as the restored prerogative of the creature resting in the Creator, and, secondly, as the superadded blessedness of a nearer than creaturely union with God in Christ

1 Ephesians 1:3

3. This Benediction is imparted through the Holy Ghost. He is the Vicar of Christ, and the Agent of His will, and the Medium of every benefit of His passion. Therefore the more full consideration of

this subject belongs to the next department of our Theology

Meanwhile, it must be remembered that the Blessing of the Gospel is obtained by Jesus the Priest, announced by Jesus the Prophet, imparted by Jesus the King, through the Mediatorial Spirit of the new economy of grace THE JEWISH AND THE CHRISTIAN TEMPLE

Before we pass to the Kingly Office of Christ we must linger for a while on the scene of His High-priestly function, which is, whether on earth or in heaven, the Temple, or Tabernacle: the place of special Divine revelation to man

I. In the Old Testament we see the progressive stages of the history of sacrificial worship converging towards the Christian Temple

1. Before the Levitical economy the Altar stood alone under the heavens: the mizbach, the first record of which is that Noah builded an altar unto the Lord, a thusiasteérion, 1 so termed from the burnt offerings SLAIN before it. From that time the patriarchs raised altars where God revealed Himself, as Abram builded an altar unto the Lord, Who appeared unto him. 2 When the law was given on Sinai Jehovah said to His people: Ye have seen that I have talked with you from heaven. Ye shall not make with Me gods of silver, neither shall ye make unto you gods of gold. An altar of earth thou shalt make unto Me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings, and thy peace offerings, thy sheep and thine oxen: in all places where I record My name I will come unto thee, and I will Mess thee. 3 From that time there was to be no longer an altar in every tent 1 Genesis 8:20; 2 Genesis 12:7; 3 Exodus 20:22; Exodus 20:24

2. The Mosaic Sanctuary was a Tabernacle, ’ohel mow`eed, the Tent of congregation, where God met His people; also the mishkan haa`eedut, the Tabernacle of Testimony, or of Covenant revelation. The innumerable details of the economy of this domain of the high priest’s function belong to archaeology: only the leading points need to be referred to here, and those only as pertaining to the Mosaic Sanctuary. There was a threefold division. In the Court, surrounding all, the Covenant People assembled; and this, in the later Temple, made silent provision for the future ingathering of the Gentiles. Here was the Altar of Burnt-offering. The sanctuary proper, the Holy Place, haqodesh admitted the priests only; it had the Table of Shewbread, the twelve loaves of which renewed every sabbath were a permanent meat offering in acknowledgment of the Divine gifts; opposite to this the Golden Candlestick, with seven lamps, the symbol of God in His Holy Spirit for ever enlightening the Temple; and between them, over against the ark of the covenant, the Altar of Incense, representing the daily intercession of the priesthood and the daily prayers of the congregation. Into the Holiest of All, the Most Holy Place, haqaadaashiym qodesh the high priest alone entered once in the year. There was the Ark, the most comprehensive symbol in the ancient worship: the Ark of the covenant, 1 which had in it the tables of the covenant, the conditions of God’s good will towards His people, and at the same time the testimony of His people’s sinfulness; the Ark of the throne of God, because His glory as a thick cloud rested on the Kapporeth or Mercy-seat, which covered the record of transgression from the Divine eyes. Over the Propitiatory were the Cherubim, so important in the symbolical drapery of the curtains, of which it was said:

0 Shepherd of Israel, Thou that dwellest between the Cherubim, shine forth! 2 These represented all the Divine attributes in their universal manifestations: barring the entrance to Paradise and

watching the way of return. But they have faded away in Christ 1 Hebrews 9:4-5; 2 Psalms 80:13. The Tabernacle, with all its divisions, was one under the supremacy of the high priest

Every figure, symbol, and act within it—from the laver at the entrance to the thick cloud of the Divine glory never seen but by faith—paid its tribute to the great Fact: there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above, the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubims. 1 It may not always be possible to trace the connection; nor is it necessary. We must be content with observing the typical allusion of the whole to the Christian temple in which the Supreme Sacrifice was once offered WITHOUT the veil, and then presented WITHIN it

1 Exodus 25:22 II. The new temple is as conspicuous in the Evangelical revelation as the old temple was in the Levitical economy

1. It is the glory of the Christian Offerer that He is the Antitype not only of the typical high priest, and of all the offerings He presented, but of the place itself in which He offered. Nor is there anything more impressive in the Great Fulfillment than the truth that the Incarnate Son is as incarnate Himself the Temple. His first prediction concerning His own Person declared this: destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up: He spake of the temple of His body. 1 His human nature—our human nature—is the shrine in which the Word, Whose Glory was as of the Only-begotten, became flesh and dwelt among us. 2 This central truth throws its beams backwards to Paradise and forwards to the Consummation: giving unity to all the Scriptural records of God's dwelling among men In Eden the Divine Presence, with the guardian Cherubim, had its ark. After the Fall the Presence of the Lord 3 was retained upon earth until the Flood. It then became the Glory of the Lord, kªbowd, over the Ark of the Covenant: permanent, as distinguished from occasional Theophanies, and as the type of the final indwelling of God in our nature. The later Jewish theology gave it the name SHEKINAH, as the tabernacle was formerly called mishkan Yahweh, the dwelling-place of Jehovah. But now in Christ Jesus, the Incarnate Son, God is abidingly manifest in the flesh. 4 The ancient symbol was the object only of faith: the Reality is object of faith also, but the Apostles could say, We beheld His glory;5 and He Himself said, he that hath seen Me hath seen the Father. 6 When He appeared it was already true that the tabernacle of God is with men, 7 though another fulfillment was in the future. The true theology of our Lord's Person holds that He inhabited human nature as His temple: He enters or is come into or in8 the flesh. Not that the Divinity is the High Priest and the flesh the temple. There are indeed two passages that seem to warrant such a view. Jesus is said to have consecrated for us a new and living way of access to God through the veil, that is to say, His flesh: 9 in His human nature He suffered; and the rending of that veil opened the way into the Holiest. But the rending of His Holy Flesh did not rend asunder His one Personality: He through the Eternal Spirit10 offered Himself in heaven when that sacred curtain was repaired. But it must be remembered that He offered HIMSELF. We must beware of the temptation to refine upon these distinctions; and not think it necessary to harmonies all the various sayings of Scripture on the great mystery which rises above all figures and analogies

1 John 2:19; 1 John 2:21; 2 John 1:14; 3 Genesis 4:16; 4 1 Timothy 3:16; 5 John 1:14; 6 John 14:9; 7 Revelation 21:3; 8 1 John 4:2; 9 Hebrews 10:20; 10 Hebrews 9:14

2. The Body of our Lord, in another view, is the mystical fellowship of His saints. In that Jesus is High Priest, and all who are His partake of His priesthood. (1.) First, the Church as such is the

sphere of the High Priest's function. He is Himself its Shekinah, whose glory from the Holiest, blending with the Sevenfold Light of the Spirit from the Holy Place, is the FULNESS OF GOD 1 for which the Apostle prays. Whosoever is in Christ lives and moves in Him as a Temple: ye are the Temple of the living God. 2 In Him all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord. 3 Thus is fulfilled the mystic prophecy of the precious ointment that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard. 4 The unction of the High Priest descends upon all His members, for He and they are one; while, in the sublime confusion of figures, those who form the spiritual house, and holy priesthood, offer up themselves as spiritual sacrifices. 5 (2.) And every individual Christian is said to be a temple in which our High Priest dwells: the whole economy of communion with heaven being translated into the believer's heart, in which he is exhorted to sanctify the Lord Christ. 6 This indwelling of the High Priest is the highest and deepest characteristic of personal religion: it is that ABODE WITH HIM 7 which the Savior reserved for His last promise to any individual on earth, as well as His last promise to any individual from heaven: I will come in to him.8

1 Ephesians 3:19; 2 2 Corinthians 6:16; 3 Ephesians 2:21; 4 Psalms 133:2; 5 1 Peter 2:5; 6 1 Peter 3:15; 7 John 14:23; 8 Revelation 3:20

3. But there is a yet wider view. Heaven and earth make the New Temple in which our High Priest ministers. It is a sanctuary not made with hands. 1 Heaven is the Holy of Holies, into which He has entered with the virtue of His sacrifice. There are the cherubims of glory without the symbol, beholding not the mercy-seat sprinkled with blood, but the Person of Jesus Who without blood and without the incense presents Himself boldly for us that we also may come with boldness. Following out the symbol to its issues, the expositor of the Christian temple says that it was necessary that the heavenly things themselves 2 should be purified with the letter sacrifices: not that heaven itself needs sprinkling, save through the One Propitiation of its God. The Holy Place is done away in a certain sense: there is but one Priest, and all believers are a royal priesthood who offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. In that outer court our Lord's altar, the Cross, was once erected. It is gone, and yet the Apostle says, We have an altar! 3 disguising, and yet scarcely disguising, his allusion to the cross. In this outer court there is no distinction of Jew and Gentile: Christ hath broken down the middle wall of partition. 4 Nor is there any other distinction. The whole family of believers as yet in probation occupies the GREAT HOUSE 5 in which there are many mansions. 6 But the strange paradox remains that, while Christian men in the militant church are on the pavement of the outer court, they are at the same time in heavenly places in Christ. 7 Hence they are exhorted with boldness to enter into the Holiest 8 above almost in the same sentence that speaks of our not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together 9 below. But these subjects belong rather to the doctrine of the Church

1 Hebrews 9:11; 2 Hebrews 9:23; 3 Hebrews 8:10; 4 Ephesians 2:14; 5 2 Timothy 2:20; 6 John 14:2; 7 Ephesians 1:3; 8 Hebrews 10:19; 9 Hebrews 10:25

4. There is one other application of the High-priestly function of our Lord to which it is important in this place to refer, however slightly. The entire scheme of the Christian atonement belongs to this office of the Messiah. Not as the Teacher, nor as the Ruler, does He save the world: save as teaching the principles of His sacrificial work, and administering the blessings it has purchased. It will hereafter be seen how much the doctrine of the Atonement is bound up with the Divine

government of a Lawgiver Who administers His law in a new court, the Court Mediatorial. There He exacts and receives what theological language terms satisfaction. But it must always be remembered that the Temple is the true sphere of atoning sacrifice. The evangelical Hall of judgment is no other than a Court of the Temple. And it is something more than a mystical fancy which regards the Veil as separating between the outer sanctuary where the oblation that satisfies justice is offered, and the Holiest where it is presented for Divine acceptance Our Lord's Atonement is the SACRIFICIAL OBEDIENCE or the OBEDIENT SACRIFICE which hath put away sin: the Obedience was rendered in the outer court where blood reigns unto death, the Sacrifice was offered in the inner shrine where mercy reigns unto life. In Christ all these things are one. And this unity is the main object of the Evangelical discussion of the Epistle to the Hebrews. On all other matters, even of an economy that was Divine, it is very brief and never solicitous to expatiate: of which we cannot now speak severally.1

1 Hebrews 9:5 THE REGAL OFFICE The Kingly authority of Christ is grounded on His sacrificial death: as its high reward; as the medium of carrying out its ends; and in its highest exercise the bestowment of the blessings purchased by His Atonement. This mediatorial dignity was arrogated by Himself on earth by anticipation and in virtue of the Divinity of His Person. After the resurrection He formally assumed it on the Mountain in Galilee; He then ascended to His throne in heaven for its exercise; and thence sends forth His Apostles to declare and enforce His royal prerogatives. The Kingdom of Christ is exhibited in their writings as the kingdom of grace: administered in the world by His Providence, in the Church, and in the hearts of believers. As such it will terminate with the final judgment; but as the kingdom of glory, already begun, and to be consummated at the great day, it will be everlasting

I. Understanding by the title King the Redeemer's mediatorial government generally, we may say that it occupies the foremost place in the Old-Testament prediction, and was accordingly assumed by our Lord as His own from the beginning. The earliest and most glorious prophecies which, went before on the Deliverer proclaimed His supreme authority. Such were the Protevangelium;

1 the promise to Abraham;2 the blessing of Jacob;3 and the predictions to David.4 The Psalms open with the kingly supremacy of the Christ, and make this their ever recurring keynote.5 The Prophets set out with this theme: it begins prophecy proper in Isaiah, and, as has been seen, runs through the whole series of the Messianic prophets, who invariably connect the announcement of the Saviour's SUFFERINGS with THE GLORY THAT SHOULD FOLLOW. The teachers in Judaism, after the Captivity, introduced a different view. They took the sufferings of the Servant of Jehovah6,7 to themselves and their own nation, and a carnal view of the reign of their Christ predominated: their favorite name for Him was KING MESSIAH.8 The Jews of Egypt differed from those of Palestine in not localizing the scene of the Messiah's government in Jerusalem, and generally in understanding His kingdom to be moral and spiritual

1 Genesis 3:15; 2 Genesis 22:17; 3 Genesis 49:10; 4 2 Samuel 7:16; 5 Psalms 2:1-12; Psalms 45:1-17; Psalms 72:1-20; Psalms 110:1-7; 6 Luke 24:26; 7 1 Peter 1:11; 8 Isaiah 52:1-15; Isaiah 53:1-12

II Our Lord opened His mission by proclaiming, not His own kingdom, but the kingdom of heaven and of God. On the nature of that spiritual government He discoursed largely; but it was not until the close of His ministry that He represented Himself as the Supreme Ruler in it. His authority till

then was that of the Teacher only: as exercised upon the Mount of Beatitudes, and vindicated for Him on the Mount of Transfiguration. His mediatorial kingdom as such was to be specially based upon His atoning death as the Divine-human Representative of Mankind. The relation between His regal government and His expiatory humiliation was declared by Himself on the eve of His passion, and is much dwelt upon by His Apostles. It is placed before us under two aspects

1. By undergoing a substitutionary death for mankind the Redeemer obtained both a judicial and a moral right to the human race.

(1.) He redeemed it from the bondage of sin and the doom of death. But in His own language and in His servants' Satan represents that bondage as the god of this world. 1 Approaching His cross our Lord said: Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the Prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men to Myself. 2 The alien power was cast out in the court of judgment, and it was decided that the world belonged to Him Who died and revived, that He might be Lord both of the dead and of the living. 3 But this was only the vindication of an authority which had been virtually His from the beginning; since He had been the King uncrowned, because the Lamb slain, from the foundation of the world. 4

(2,) His moral right is that which the infinite benefit of His passion confers; and it is this which draws men to His feet. It is the gracious and effectual sway of the atoning sacrifice on all who accept its propitiation: ye are bought with a price.5 1 2 Corinthians 4:4; 2 John 12:31-32; 3 Romans 14:8-9; 4 Revelation 13:8; 5 1 Corinthians 6:20

2. The self-renunciation of Jesus receives universal government as its reward. He obtained as a gift the dominion over mankind: Glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son also may glorify Thee: as Thou hast given Him power over all flesh, that He should give eternal life to as many as Thou hast given Him.1 But He also received the mediatorial government of the universe: Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him the name which is above every name. 2 Whether or not the virtue of His passion extended to other worlds, certainly its reward and honor extends to them 1 John 17:1-2; 2 Php 2:9 III. After His resurrection He formally assumed His regal sway

1. It was on the Mountain of Galilee, to which He summoned His Apostles and disciples, and virtually the whole company of believers, that He for the first time announced His absolute authority in human affairs. Above He had said, All Mine are Thine, and Thine are Mine, 1 with a wider and deeper meaning; but now He declares, All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth: 2 all power in heaven AND earth, in heaven FOR earth Having already proclaimed His rule below as Lord of the dead, 3 and having declared it in the midst of His brethren on earth, He then ascended up to exercise it for ever 1 John 27:10; 2 Matthew 28:18; 3 Romans 14:9

2. Hence it is obvious that the regal office of Christ must not include His government of the universe as the eternal Son. And further we are prepared for the doctrine of St. Paul, that the jurisdiction obtained by the Mediator will, after all its designs are subserved in the salvation of the saints and the subjection of His enemies, be surrendered to the Father, and mediatorial authority shall cease. It began after the Cross, and will therefore end when the redeeming design is fulfilled

IV. The formal analysis of the Redeemer's regal office, set forth in the Acts as exercised on earth, in the Apocalypse as exercised in heaven, and in the Epistles theologically described, can only be summarized here. Almost every topic finds its more appropriate place hereafter in the

Administration of Redemption

1. The kingdom of Christ is the Christian Church or the kingdom of grace. As such its treatment must be reserved for a later stage. Meanwhile, some points of importance require brief notice

(1.) This kingdom is in its widest meaning the re-establishment of the Divine authority over man. It is the kingdom of heaven, because its Ruler is ascended into heaven, and there sits upon the throne of saving authority; because its object is to restore the principles of heavenly obedience upon earth, according to our first great prayer: Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth, as it is done in heaven; 1 and because it will be consummated when earth becomes heaven and heaven earth to mankind. It is the kingdom of God, because the Incarnate Ruler is Himself Divine; and it is thus also distinguished from the kingdoms of this world 2 which are ordained of God to be the types and reflections of His supreme rule. Hence the Church, as the kingdom of Christ, is essentially a spiritual authority over spiritual subjects. Whatever relation it may sustain to the transitory governments of time, it is entirely independent of them. And, whatever externality it may assume for a season, its profound and abiding character is the internal and spiritual reconstruction of the THEOCRACY in which God, now the God-man, rules over a saved mankind. (2.) It has indeed an outward organization: laws and administration of law, rulers and submission to rulers, terms of admission and penalties of excommunication. But all these are connected rather with the Visible Church, or visible Churches, than with the Kingdom of Christ, which is the glorious restoration of Divine authority over man: one, spiritual, ever enlarging and tending to its consummation in heaven. The KINGDOM has a meaning which the CHURCH has not 1 Matthew 6:10; 2 Revelation 11:15

2. This will be further apparent if we consider how habitually the kingdom of our Lord is declared to be set up within the individual heart. It is the interior life of religion, and coincides with the imparted blessings of personal salvation under the New Covenant, and the ethical relations which result from them. There is no view of personal religion more comprehensive than that which makes it the absolute sway of One Ruler within the heart

3. It is the jurisdiction over the world for the sake of the Christian Church. The New Testament abounds with testimonies, which find their highest expression in St. Paul’s words concerning the mighty power that hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be the Head over all things to the church, which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all. 1 The providential government of human affairs is in the hands of Christ for the sake of the Body of a new mankind which He is gathering and sanctifying to Himself. (1.) Hence the kingly office of the LORD OF ALL 2 is exercised in the protection of His people; He is the Captain of their salvation: 3 He hath on His vesture and on His thigh a name written: KING or KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS. 4 (2.) It is the Headship of a conquering Gospel which must in some sense win the world, subjugate and suppress Satanic powers, and rescue mankind as such. When our Lord first announced His authority He added the words: Make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world. 5 He Whose Name is ABOVE EVERY NAME6 here pays fealty to the Holy Trinity whose Representative He is. But the final accomplishment of the designs of heaven is bound up with obedience to Himself. For that He waits on His throne. With this Lo we may connect another in the Old Testament: Lo, My

Servant, Whom I uphold! He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till He have set judgment in the earth.7 1 Ephesians 1:22-23; 2 Acts 10:36; 3 Hebrews 2:10; 4 Revelation 19:16; 5 Matthew 28:19; 6 Php 2:9; 7 Isaiah 42:1

4. The last function of mediatorial sway will be the final judgment; when the High Priest shall no longer intercede for the world nor the Prophet teach mankind, but the Son of Man, Who is also the King, shall sit upon the throne of His glory, and before Him shall be gathered all nations: 1 gathered for the first and last time that He may separate them again to be united no more 1 Matthew 25:31-32

5. While the Mediatorial King will lay down His authority, the same King, as Head of the Church, shall reign for ever. And of His kingdom—as the indwelling of the supreme glory of the Godhead in mankind—there shall be no end. 1 But these are subjects that belong to Eschatology

1 Luke 1:33

21. Vol 02 - Names of the Redeemer

Names of the Redeemer NAMES OF THE REDEEMER:

Pretemporal Dignity

Divine Names Of His One Person

Official Names

Combinations

Practical Use

Almost all the elements of Christian doctrine may be connected with the appellations which the Scripture gives to our Lord, as they are supplemented in some cases by theological nomenclature. What the names of God are in Theology proper, the names of Christ are in Christology. They define all we know of His pretemporal being, of His general Mediatorial relations, whether as the humbled or as the exalted Christ, of His specific Messianic offices, and of His relations to the Church in administered salvation They have passed in review already, but may with considerable advantage be classified

I. The names of the supra-human, supra-creaturely pretemporal being who became man are twofold: those which belong to Him absolutely as Divine, and those which belong to Him as the Second Person in the Deity

1. He is GOD absolutely, or the GREAT GOD, GOD BLESSED FOR EVER.1 He is JEHOVAH OR LORD; the LORD OF GLORY;2 the FIRST AND THE LAST; the BEGINNING AND THE END:3 words implying both the Shaddai and the Adonai of the Old Testament, both the interior selfsufficiency and the external omnipotence of the Divine Being 1 Romans 9:5; 2 1 Corinthians 2:8; 3 Revelation 22:13

2. As the Second Person in the Godhead He is the Song of Solomon 2:1-17 he SON or GOD, [God] ONLY BEGOTTEN, 1 WISDOM, the ANGEL OF JEHOVAH, the WORD OF LIFE, the WORD OF GOD, the WORD, the [MAGE OF GOD, the EFFULGENCE OF HIS GLORY, the FIRSTBORN3 before every creature; the BEGINNING or Author OF THE CREATION OF GOD,4 of His own creation as God. With reference to most of these names it may be said that, while they are based upon the original dignity of the Son, they are given to Him in His incarnate relations; not one of them but has some indirect reference to the Divine-human estate

1 John 1:18; 2 Hebrews 1:2; 3 Colossians 1:15; 4 Revelation 3:14 II. The names that expressly formulate the union of the two natures in the One Person of Christ are in the Scriptures few

1. Obviously IMMANUEL, 1 God with us, 2 takes the lead: a name once used symbolically and typically in the Old Testament; in the New so applied as to become personal; yet never adopted after its first proclamation. It is the first in the Gospels, and will in reality be the last, surviving as

the expression of an eternal truth when most others have become historical. Some descriptions of the one Incarnate Person found in the prophets have not been transmitted to the New Testament. Such is the term THE BRANCH. This belongs to our Lord's human nature: And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots; 3 but also to His Divine: In that day shall the Branch of the Lord be beautiful and glorious, and the fruit of the earth shall be excellent and comely, 4 where the human is the fruit of the earth and the Divine the Branch of the Lord THE SON is one of those Divine names of the eternal Second Person which connect Him with the temporal Manifestation: so in the baptismal formula, 5 where it is difficult to detach the word from its connection with the Incarnate. With special reference to His Person as including the Manhood the name SON OF GOD6 is also sometimes used 1 Isaiah 7:14; 2 Matthew 1:23; 3 Isaiah 11:1; 4 Isaiah 4:2; 5 Matthew 28:19; 6 John 9:35

2. One designation stands out with peculiar prominence, as derived from the Redeemer's relation to mankind: THE SON OF MAN. Once occurring in Daniel, it was adopted habitually by our Lord; under peculiar circumstances it was used by St. Stephen; and then is heard no more. It suggests that instance of the term MAN where He is called MEDIATOR, the solitary example which permits us to employ the word as describing the Person of our Lord: ánthroopos Christós Ieesoús,1 Christ Jesus, not a man or the man, but MAN

1 1 Timothy 2:5

3. None of the phrases used in Scripture has been retained in the language of theology to express the union of the two natures in the Person of Christ. The source of the word GODMAN is lost in obscurity: Origen's claim to it is doubtful. In theological language such terms are used as THE INCARNATE, the DIVINE-HUMAN PERSON, the THEANTHROPIC PERSON

III. The designations of the Son of God in His official aspect towards the universe and to mankind are of course the most numerous and the most important. They are based on a variety of principles, and require arrangement

1. First, those names of our Lord's Divine and eternal nature which connect Him with the creation generally must be distinguished; especially as they form a transition to His redeeming relations. Going back to the pretemporal titles, we find that the Eternal Word is the PRINCE or LIFE.1 As the Author of all life, He is THE LIFE absolutely. Thence He is OUR LIFE; the PRINCE or Captain OF SALVATION,2 the PRINCE or Author OF THE FAITH,3 Archeegón in these passages meaning nothing less than that He is the eternal Source and Beginning of that life which is to us salvation, and is obtained in faith: whence, combining them all, He is a PRINCE AND A SAVIOUR.4 Though these titles bring the Lord within the redeeming economy, they have their ground in an eternal relation of the Son in the Trinity as the Originator of all creaturely existence 1 Acts 3:15; 2 Hebrews 2:10; 3 Hebrews 12:2; 4 Acts 5:31

2. There are some which belong to the times of prophetic preparation, and are not continued in the New Testament: such are the ANGEL OF JEHOVAH, the MESSENGER of the Covenant,1 and the SERVANT OF THE LORD.2 These three should be marked in their unity and gradation: the last of them reappears in the New Testament when Christ is called a MINISTER,3 and in the words of St. Peter, who speaks of God having raised up in our nature for His Messianic work His SON Jesus,4 where Pais is used as in some sense intermediate between Son and servant.

Reference may be made to the names, or the cluster of names, given to the coming Redeemer in Isaiah: And His Name shall be called WONDERFUL, COUNSELLOR, THE MIGHTY GOD, THE EVERLASTING FATHER, THE PRINCE OF PEACE.5 In earlier times He was foreannounced as SHILOH,6 PEACE,7 which suggests the PRINCE OF PEACE, and He is our PEACE: there is no word more intimately and sacredly bound up with the Lord and His work. And earliest of all we find Him designated the SEED:8 of the Woman, of Abraham, and of David

1 Malachi 3:1; 2 Isaiah 42:1-25; Isaiah 43:1-28; 3 Romans 15:8; 4 Acts 3:26; 5 Isaiah 9:6; 6 Genesis 49:10; 7 Ephesians 2:14; 8 Genesis 3:15

3. The names which denote the relation of the Incarnate Son to His work generally occupy the central place in this classification

(1.) Some of them define His office in its widest range and in its universal issues. The largest and broadest of these is JESUS,1 from the Hebrew Jehoshua or Joshua, Help of the Lord, or Lord-Savior: the NAME OF JESUS2 has a supreme meaning in the New Testament

He is the PRINCE OF SALVATION, THE SAVIOUR: of all men from the penalty of original sin; and, of those who believe, from all evil: from its guilt and from its indwelling, that is from sin and from sinfulness. He is the SALVATION of His people: Say ye to the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy Salvation cometh; beheld, His reward is with Him, and His work before Him.3 He is the Hebrew MESSIAH, and the universal CHRIST, as the Anointed Agent of the Divine will, and the source of the anointing of His saints by the Spirit. In both Testaments He is the HOLY ONE,4 as THE LORD'S ANOINTED. In the execution of all His offices combined He is our REDEEMER5 from the penalty and power of sin, and from Satan its representative, and the world its sphere; but this name is not generally given to Him in Scripture, though constantly applied to His work. When our Lord, approaching His passion, said, The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many6, He all but called Himself THE MINISTER OF REDEMPTION, which is the New-Testament form of the Old-Testament SERVANT of God In His whole manifestation He is the LIGHT of the Gentiles,7 the GLORY of Israel,8 the DESIRE9 of all nations: according to the beautiful but doubtful Vulgate translation, Desideratus cunctis gentibus

1 Php 2:10; 2 Hebrews 2:13; 3 Isaiah 62:11; 4 1 John 2:20; 5 Isaiah 59:20; 6 Matthew 20:28; 7 Isaiah 42:6; 8 Isaiah 17:3; 9 Haggai 2:7

(2.) Besides these appellatives, which have become, as it were, proper names, we find almost every aspect of the benefit of His work providing a title for Him. He is not called the Justifier: it is God that justifieth;1 but as both the ground and the administrator of that justification He is THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS;2 and He is Jesus Christ THE RIGHTEOUS.3 In the temple where holiness reigns He is Himself emphatically THE SANCTIFIER,4 and THE HOLY ONE,5 sharing these titles with the Father and the Spirit

Between our justification in the court, and our sanctification in the temple, comes in our new life in the house of God; and Christ as the Only-begotten is THE PRINCE OF LIFE;6 of that life which springs from union with Himself. As to the covenant ratified in His blood,7 He is THE MEDIATOR as its ground in His Person and work; the SURETY,8 as the living Pledge in heaven, both for God and man, of the observance of its conditions and the bestowment of its blessings; the TESTATOR,9 as appointing to His household those blessings by His will on death. Looking at the

ultimate accomplishment of all its designs Hs is THE FINISHER10 of the Faith, and THE LIFE11 of believers: the life under its two aspects gives Him two names: He is THE RESURRECTION12 from universal death, and He is ETERNAL LIFE13 in its everlasting issues

1 Romans 8:33; 2 Jeremiah 23:6; 3 1 John 2:1; 4 Hebrews 2:11; 5 Acts 3:14; 6 Acts 3:15; 7 Hebrews 9:14; 8 Hebrews 7:22; 9 Hebrews 9:16; 10 Hebrews 12:2; 11 John 14:6; 12 John 11:25; 13 1 John 1:2

IV. The specific offices of the Redeemer yield Him a variety of titles, each of which describes one aspect of His work, and is inappropriate as applied to the Person of Christ generally. Of course those only are referred to which are limited to each office, and for the most part such as are found in Scripture or in the exact reproductions of Scriptural language. Some of them are too limited for common application

1. The Lord as the Revealer of the Divine will is pre-eminently the PROPHET. This was one of the earliest prophetical designations; but when once shown that in Him the fulfillment had come, the term is no longer applied: it is left to His servants the prophets, whether of the Old or of the New Testament. For the same reason those titles have been disused which were given to our Lord with special reference to His Israelitish mission: such as RABBI, MASTER, TEACHER, MINISTER OF THE CIRCUMCISION. Once, and once only, is He the APOSTLE, that is, the antitype of Moses, as He is the HIGH-PRIEST 1 and antitype of Aaron: the only place in which our Lord is directly connected with these two persons as united. It might have been expected that here He would have been termed the Prophet; but the mission of Moses is referred to as the type of that more than a prophet, Who said, As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. 2 It is with reference to His prophetic office that He is THE WISDOM OF GOD, THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD, THE TRUTH: from God, to enlighten men, and perfect human knowledge. There is an emphasis on His being the TRUE LIGHT that enlighteneth every man, as also on His being the Truth, both as its substance and its Teacher 1 Hebrews 3:1; 2 John 20:21

2. As the atoning Representative of mankind, that is, in His sacerdotal office, Jesus has many titles, both descriptive and personal. He is the HIGH-PRIEST: first, as the Antitype of Aaron, and, secondly, as the Head of a fellowship of priests, the High-priest of our confession. 1 But as He is now the only Offerer for sacrifice, the offerings of His people being presented by Him, He is the PRIEST absolutely: the great Sacrificer and Intercessor for man. Thus the former sanctions the universal priesthood of Christians, while the latter abrogates every special ministerial priesthood. From His sacrificial work2 He derives many appellatives which have become almost personal names. He is the living PROPITIATORY 3 or Mercy-seat, or atoning Sacrifice. He is the Victim of His own oblation, the unity of all victims, though only one gives Him a designation: THE LAMB. The preeminence of this is that it continues to be the name of Jesus in all His offices in heaven; describing the Incarnate in the Triune glory receiving the homage of the universe in the midst of the throne, 4 as the King, taking the Book as the Prophet, and still as it had been slain. Thus the Baptist’s LAMB OF GOD, 5 which does not directly reappear in the New- Testament phraseology, is given back from heaven to earth, and has never ceased to be familiar in Christian devotion. When the Christian Prophet writes as an Apostle he terms the Intercessor in heaven an ADVOCATE or PARACLETE 6 for His people: the Word being as much an appellative of Jesus Christ as it is of the Holy Ghost, the Comforter. St. John rises above all former precedent in calling

that PLEADER in heaven the living PROPITIATION 1 Hebrews 3:3; 2 Ephesians 5:2; 3 Romans 3:25; 4 Revelation 5:6; 5 John 1:29; 6 1 John 2:1-2

3. In His regal office our Savior is LORD of all, His highest name; KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS: 1 all power is of God; all lower dignities are given to the supreme Authority, and hence His many crowns. 2 KING absolutely Jesus is not named, save indirectly in one of His own parables; but He is the KING'S SON. PRINCE He is of peace and of life; but the term PRINCE OF LIFE does not refer to authority so much as to priority and origination: He is the Archeegón tos zoween. 3 St. Peter calls Him a PRINCE and a Savior And He is the CAPTAIN of salvation. As Lord He is also the JUDGE; but as He Himself said, / came not to judge the world, but to save the world, 4 so He does not assume this title. Though the Father hath committed all judgment unto theSong of Solomon 5:1-16 yet that Son scarcely bears the name: God is the Judge of all.6 1 1 Timothy 6:15; 2 Revelation 19:12; 3 Acts 5:31; 4 John 12:47; 5 John 5:22; 6 Hebrews 12:23

V. It is profitable to mark also the permutations and combinations of the titles that are bestowed on the Redeemer, or by which He is invoked. The most obvious is JESUS CHRIST: this does not mean only, as is sometimes said, the personal and the official name: both are official names. The variation in the order is arbitrary. Both Jesus and Christ are found as proper names, and without the article. But when the term Lord is connected with them there is generally some reason in the context. Especially is this the case when the full assemblage of His august titles is given Him: mark the predominance of our LORD JESUS CHRIST in the first Epistles referring to His coming; 1 when He is also called THE LORD absolutely. Once we read of the fellowship of His SON JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD.2 GOD OUR SAVIOUR3 and THE GREAT GOD AND OUR SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST occur only in the Pastoral Epistle to Titus. St. Jude calls Him THE ONLY WISE GOD OUR SAVIOUR.4 St. Peter, THE SHEPHERD AND BISHOP5 of our souls; and he gives the most enlarged formula: OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST.7 But the Lord perhaps most magnifies His own name: I am ALPHA AND OMEGA, THE FIRST AND THE LAST, THE BEGINNING AND THE END;6 the same as the Divine name in Rev. chapter 1 And again: These things saith HE THAT is HOLY, HE THAT is TRUE, HE THAT HATH THE KEY OF DAVID.8 And again, These things saith THE AMEN, THE FAITHFUL and TRUE WITNESS, the BEGINNING OF THE CREATION OF GOD.9 One of the Elders called Him THE LION OF THE TRIBE OF JUDA, THE ROOT OF DAVID.10 Once more it is said of Him that He hath on His vesture and on His thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS.11 His last testimony to Himself is: I am the ROOT AND THE OFFSPRING OF DAVID, and the BRIGHT AND MORNING STAR.12 The final words of the Bible invoke the grace of OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. But a NEW NAME13 has yet to be revealed

1 1 Thessalonians 2:19; 1 Thessalonians 5:27-28; 2 1 Corinthians 1:9; 3 Titus 2:10; Titus 2:13; 4 Jude 1:25; 5 1 Peter 2:15; 6 Revelation 1:8; 22:13; 7 2 Peter 1:11; 8 Revelation 3:7; 9 Revelation 3:14; 10 Revelation 5:5; 11 Revelation 19:16; 12 Revelation 22:16; 13 Revelation 2:17

VI. There is another class of appellatives which refer to our Lord's relations to His people. These are metaphors, or symbols, or abstract terms expressing qualities personified in Him: not precisely names, they are yet more than mere adjectival descriptions, and are used in the Christian Church very much to the advantage of its practical and devotional literature. They comprise also figures derived from almost every region of the mental, and the moral, and the physical worlds. As our

Lord has many crowns, so has He many names: He is clothed with more titles and epithets, attributes and properties, than any other object in the universe. Omitting all those which are His because they are God's, we find in Scripture an endless abundance applied to the Redeemer distinctively The largest number of these indicate His relations to His Church: though rather as defining that relation than as giving Him appellatives. He is the ROCK or FOUNDATION on which the Church is built: that is, the underlying primitive foundation on which the foundation of Apostles and Prophets rests: what devotion has termed THE ROCK OF AGES

Hence He is the CHIEF CORNER STONE.1 Leaving this metaphor, He is to His Church the GOOD SHEPHERD, the Vine, its HEAD2,3 as it is a corporate body, and for its sake the Head of the universe also. Again, He is THE WAY: in which alone all men have access to God, to life, and to heaven. He is the FRIEND OF SINNERS;4 the BRIDEGROOM5 of His Church; and, by implication, the BROTHER6 of His disciples. Generally, it may be said that every blessing of which He is the source or medium gives Him a name. He is the FOUNTAIN opened,8 the WATER and the BREAD of life, and the PHYSICIAN of souls. He is the DOOR7 of access to God, and life and heaven. He is to His people ALL AND IN ALL:9 Panta kai en pasin Christos. It is deeply interesting to trace how variously these Scriptural figures have been enshrined in the devotional ideas of antiquity, and sanctified by art to the memorial of our Lord. For instance, the ancient Church has transmitted the sacred name under the letters IHS, Jesus Hominum Salvator, Jesus the Savior of men. The word ichthus, fish, was also in familiar use: being composed of the capital letters of Iesous Christos, Theos uios, sother. Sometimes the letters INRI stood for Jesus Nazarenus, Rex Judseorum. But all this takes us beyond or below our Biblical theology

1 1 Peter 2:6; 2 Ephesians 1:22; 3 Colossians 2:19; 4 Luke 7:34; 5 Matthew 25:6; 6 John 20:17; 7 John 10:7; 8 Zechariah 13:1; 9 Colossians 3:11 VII. The practical use of the study of these names is obvious

1. It is the Divine method of teaching us the doctrines of the economy of redemption; he who understands the derivation, uses, and bearings of the rich cluster of terms, in their Hebrew and Greek symbols especially, which are arranged in this sketch, will have no mean knowledge of this branch of theology and of theology in general. Such a study will also tend to give precision to the language of the theologian, especially the preacher, who will observe with what exquisite propriety every epithet is used by Evangelists and Apostles in relation to the Person and work and relations of the Redeemer. There can be no better theological exercise than the study of Evangelical doctrine as based upon the titles of Jesus

2. No study more surely tends to exalt our Lord. We cannot range in thought over the boundless names given by inspiration to our adorable Master without feeling that there is no place worthy of Him below the highest, that He cannot be less than God to our faith and reverence, and devotion and love. He is precious1 beyond human estimation: hee timeé, He is all that precious-ness means to those who believe; no words can describe the greatness of His Person and the dignity it confers on all that is His. Whatsoever toucheth Him is holy

1 1 Peter 2:7

3. The subject suggests also the importance of great caution in the use of the terms that have been adopted by uninspired theology to supplement the Scripture. Most of these have been

alluded to above. It will be observed that while some of them are very valuable, indeed indispensable, in dogmatic theology, none have lodged in the common language of Christendom but those which the New Testament gives

4. Lastly, the spirit of reverence must lead us to conform our thoughts and our words concerning Him, whether in devotion or preaching or meditation, to the example of the Scriptures. Those whom He called His friends,1 and would not call His servants, those whom He, after the resurrection, termed My brethren,2 made it their practice to abstain from reciprocating these names: Jesus is never their Friend nor their Brother; nor is there one epithet of endearment applied to Him in all their writings. The Father alone calls Him Beloved: Behold, Mine Elect, in Whom My soul delighteth!3 in the Old-Testament prophecy, given back again and again with increase in the New-Testament fulfillment: This is My belovedSong of Solomon 4:1-16 With regard to the Father alone is Christ said to be dear: His dearSong of Solomon 5:1-16 though even then it is only the Son of His love. As to the Apostles, and all their followers, they are His bondservants, doulos; He is their LORD JESUS CHRIST. We must be guided by their example. It is our most blessed self-denial to suppress the overflowings of human affection towards Him in Whom we rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.6 In every thought of Him, and word concerning Him, the Divinity in the Incarnate Person must ever be pre-eminent and govern all 1 John 15:15; 2 John 20:17; 3 Isaiah 53:1; 4 Matthew 7:5; 5 Colossians 1:13; 6 1 Peter 1:8

22. Vol 02 - The Finished Work

The Finished Work THE FINISHED WORK: THE VICARIOUS OBLATION OF PERFECT OBEDIENCE CHRIST'S ATONEMENT as to Himself an Obedience unto Death Obedience or Sacrifice Obedience and Sacrifice

Virtue or Merit not for Himself but for us VICARIOUS EXPIATION AND PROPITIATION as to Man Vicarious as to the World Representative as to His People in their Mystical Union with Him Satisfaction and Expiation Atonement and Propitiation Scriptural Phraseology Theological Modifications This comprehensive historical view of the Saviour's manifestation leads finally to what is its one result as it respects the salvation of mankind. This is sometimes called Atonement, sometimes Redemption: the former term derived from the efficient virtue, the latter from the effect, of the Saviour's intervention. The teaching of Scripture on this subject may be summed as follows: The Finished Work, as accomplished by the Mediator Himself, in His relation to mankind, is His Divine-human obedience regarded as an expiatory sacrifice: the Atonement proper. Then it may be studied in its results as to God, as to God and man, and as to man. First, it is the supreme manifestation of the glory and consistency of the Divine attributes; and, as to this, is termed the Righteousness of God

Secondly, as it respects God and man, it is the Reconciliation, a word which involves two truths, or rather one truth under two aspects: the propitiation of the Divine displeasure against the world is declared; and therefore the sin of the world is no longer a bar to acceptance. Thirdly, in its influence on man, it may be viewed as Redemption: universal as to the race, limited in its process and consummation to those who believe These general propositions express the revelations of Scripture mainly in its own terms Their modifications in historical theology will be considered afterwards and in strict subordination. The term FINISHED ATONEMENT must be understood to be used here with a threefold design. First, it is intended to mark the compendious result or summary of the work of Christ in all His offices, and in its final expression: almost every element of the doctrine of the Atonement has been introduced in the previous section, which traced the historical manifestation of the Redeeming Mediator; but now the issue of all is set forth in its finished statement. Secondly, it gives emphasis to the fact that the work of Christ is here viewed objectively, as the atonement for mankind; it is the accomplished redemption as apart from the application of it; it is the basis and foundation of all that follows in the economy of the Holy Ghost. Thirdly, this meaning is to be kept distinct from that which refers the finished work of Christ to the secured salvation of the Elect, laying the stress on its being finished FOR THEM once for all and for ever. It is perfect in the design of God and in the work of His Son; but its application to individual sinners is perpetually beginning afresh THE VICARIOUS OBLATION Our Saviour's sacrifice on the cross finished a perfect obedience which He offered in His Divine-human Person. This was His own obedience, and therefore of infinite value or worthiness; but it was vicarious/ and its benefit belongs absolutely to our race, and, on certain conditions, to every member of it. As availing for man, by the appointment of God, it is no less than the satisfaction, provided by Divine love, of the claims of Divine justice upon transgression: which may be viewed, on the one hand, as

an expiation of the punishment due to the guilt of human sin; and, on the other, as a propitiation of the Divine displeasure, which is thus shown to be consistent with infinite goodwill to the sinners of mankind. But the expiation of guilt and the propitiation of wrath are one and the same effect of the Atonement. Both suppose the existence of sin and the wrath of God against it. But, in the mystery of the Atonement, the provision of eternal mercy, as it were, anticipates the transgression, and love always in every representation of it has the pre-eminence. The passion is the exhibition rather than the cause of the Divine love to man THE ATONEMENT

Viewed as His own, the expiatory work of Christ was a perfect spontaneous Obedience and a perfect spontaneous Sacrifice to the Will of the Father imposed upon Him. The two terms may be regarded in their difference and in their unity as constituting the act and virtue of the Atonement. Its worthiness, or what is sometimes called its merit, connects it with the human race, and depends on two other truths; it was not due for Himself, but was an act of infinite charity for man; and that act was Divine, both in its value and in its efficiency. The offering of the Redeemer had infinite efficacy for the human race The atonement was our Lord's OBEDIENCE unto death; and it was the SACRIFICE of His life in perfect obedience. There is one passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews which perfectly unites these two representations: Lo, I come to do Thy will, 0 God!1 These words, twice uttered, present the Saviour's whole work as one great act of obedience. But they are preceded and followed by a reference to sacrifice. First, to the sacrifices offered by the law, which are displaced: sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not, but a body hast Thou prepared Me; then to His own perfect oblation: by the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. The obedience to the will of God is the sacrifice of the body prepared for our atoning Mediator 1 Hebrews 10:5-10 1. Either of these words taken alone expresses the quality and character of the atoning act.

(1.) It was a great OBEDIENCE, in the perfect submission of His will to the will of the Father, which required the surrender of His life as the penalty of guilt: all was summed up in that one word. He undertook the service of man's redemption as laid upon Him, and He accomplished it through all its requirements down to the suffering of the penalty of Divine displeasure against sin: He became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.1 As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the Obedience of One shall many be made righteous.2 Here the whole work of atonement is one obedience which counterbalances the act of man's disobedience.

(2.) But it was also a passive endurance of a lot imposed upon Him from the moment of His assumption of our nature; and this is expressed by the word SACRIFICE. It is true that our Representative offered the sacrifice freely of His own will; but the whole series and detail of His humiliations, sorrows, and derelictions came upon Him as it were from without: from the mysterious pressure of sin without guilt, from the enmity of the world and of Satan, from the visitation of the Father. His entire incarnate existence on earth was a meek endurance: Ought not Christ to have suffered these things? Thus it is written!3 1 Php 2:8; 2 Romans 5:19; 3 Luke 24:26; Luke 24:46;

2. Their difference, however, must also be marked; though now only in relation to our Lord Himself.

(1.) The Obedience regards the whole work of Christ as an active fulfillment of righteousness, passing through all stages to its consummation in death. As the appointed Representative of

mankind He had an atoning work to do, which included, and also infinitely exceeded, the ordinary duty of human nature. Yet He learned obedience by the things which He suffered.1 We never read of any obedience of the Godman which was not submission and endurance. He entered on His career of duty by this gate. The moral law was to Him as law written afresh and in one character, as the expansion of one only duty. It is not said that His obedience was made perfect by suffering; but that He Himself was as a Sufferer made perfect through sufferings.2 His supreme submission to that law was His finished obedience; and that consummate selfsurrender tested and approved in extreme temptation was the active side of His atonement: the negativing sin itself in His own Person, representing mankind.

(2.) But the very same deeds and sorrows which undid or cancelled the sin of humanity were a suffering endurance of the penalty of sin; and this was the passive side of His atonement: the tribute of expiatory satisfaction to the justice of the Lawgiver. The mystery and perfection of our Saviour's Atoning Act was this, that, as vicarious, it at one and the same moment made both the sin and the penalty as though they were not. Viewed in one light He represents man as canceling his sin by a new obedience; viewed in another He represents man as discharging the debt as penalty 1 Hebrews 5:8; 2 Hebrews 2:10

3. It will perhaps throw some light both upon the unity and upon the difference of these two terms if we refer them to the Mediatorial Court and the Mediatorial Temple respectively Viewed as a tribute to Righteousness the Ministry of our Lord is simply and solely a great Obedience, active AND passive, and nothing more. Law demands both obedience and the penalty of disobedience: not both at once from man and in human courts; but from the Representative of man and in the court Divine both are required, and both in His life and death are offered. Viewed as a tribute to the Holiness of the Divine nature the Ministry of our Lord is a sacrifice which God accepts as offered for the human race

Transferred into the Holiest the satisfaction of Divine justice becomes a satisfaction of Divine love. And here the same most wonderful combination of two ideas comes in. As an expiatory sacrifice to the holiness of God the soul of the sinner could not be at once offered in death and accepted as living; could not be at once a sin offering doomed to destruction and a burnt offering well pleasing to God. But in man's Representative at the holy altar these most gloriously meet. He presented a sacrifice which was the veritable endurance of the consequence of transgression:

He died unto sin once.1 But that death was also the LIVING SACRIFICE2 of our human nature, given back to God in its perfection again. As in the court of law perfect obedience is rendered by discharge of a duty which was also the suffering of the penalty of disobedience, so in the temple of holiness an expiation of guilt by death is itself the display of propitiation towards the living offender

These seem to be paradoxes; but they express the very secret and mystery of our redemption. It cannot, however, be too deeply impressed that these two are only aspects of one atonement. As an obedience unto death it becomes ours in justification; as a sacrifice of self-surrender, it becomes ours in sanctification 1 Romans 6:10; 2 Romans 12:1 ITS VIRTUE OR MERIT The term ATONEMENT, by which the sacred writers express the idea of Reconciliation as the effect of Christ's work, is in modern theology used to express the virtue of the redeeming passion as resting upon the merit of Him who suffered it. The value of the perfect oblation is of great importance, as the link which connects it with us. Neither of these words is used in Scripture, which, however,

always assumes and implies the inconceivable price at which are to be valued both the Person and the work of the Redeemer Himself

1. Nothing that belongs to the incarnate history of Jesus can be regarded as terminating in Himself, He was not man for His own sake: had He joined us for His own glory His alliance with our race would not have been by incarnation and birth into its dying lineage

He became man that He might give us what He needed not for Himself. Virtue there would have been, but not merit, in the sorrows of one who expiated his own sin, and in that sense was made perfect through suffering. Remembering that the Redeemer's duty was His passion, and that in His example as proposed to us this is always prominent, if not alone, we shall see the force of St. Peter's words: Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the Just for the unjust.1 Almost every leading exhibition of the Atonement in Scripture makes the sinlessness of the Redeemer prominent; and this implies that His passion was voluntary and for others. Nowhere is the active righteousness regarded as obligatory on Christ: He descended to a kind of obedience which was no necessity of His being. Hence both as a Sacrifice and as an Obedience the Lord's work was for us: meritorious, to use our human term, as not required for Himself

1 1 Peter 3:18

2. The atoning work itself was a manifestation of perfect charity viewed as offered by a Man. If we strive to rise to the conception that our Lord's obedience and sacrifice were presented by a member of our race untainted by sin, and therefore reckoned to such a Person as something most precious in the sight of Heaven, and then superadd to this that, being God, He can bestow on His creatures this Gift of His own work, then we have the Scriptural teaching of an offering presented by Man for himself: combining supreme love to God and supreme charity to mankind in the highest perfection of both. Now we must so view it, as our own oblation. Man was in Christ reconciling God to himself by the most precious oblation. We are Christ's and Christ is ours. The Redeemer was not His own but our possession. He gave Himself TO us before He gave Himself FOR us. When He obeyed unto a sacrificial death we undid our sin by a perfect obedience, and at the same time gave our life and our all as a penalty for our sin. Our redeeming Representative was our Sin-offering and Burnt-offering in one: in Him we give our life to justice, and present our expiated life anew to God, and both in one

3. But the virtue, value, and merit of the Atonement must be measured by the value of His Person who is at once the Offering and the Offerer. It is an unreal abstraction that we consider when we speak of the Great Oblation being presented by man. But it becomes a most blessed concrete reality when we regard it as offered by the God-man Who gave Himself.1 As God He gave His human life, but more than that: He gave the value of His Divine Sonship with it. As Man He freely presented Himself in obedience to the Father; but it was the Eternal Spirit of His Divinity that gave Him the strength to make the offering, and impressed on it its value when made. Here is the secret of our Saviour's merit: it is only the human word for the Divine complacency in the submission of His Son. This is My Beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased.2 The meaning here is, that on this Man, or Representative of man, God can look with more than the original satisfaction with which He regarded Adam. He saw His beloved Son incarnate; and, when He uttered His complacency, it was over the whole work and passion of Christ, which was anticipated as finished; and, as finished, made available for the human race 1 1 Timothy 2:6; 2 Matthew 17:5 THE VICARIOUS

EXPIATION AND PROPITIATION As the Atonement avails for the human race, and is therefore ours, it must be viewed as a vicarious satisfaction of the claims of Divine justice or expiation of the guilt of sin, and propitiation of the Divine favor No adjective equivalent to the term Vicarious, as expressing the Redeemer's relation to mankind, is used in Scripture; nor is there any equivalent for Substitution, the noun corresponding to the adjective. But the idea of a strictly vicarious representation lies at the root of its teaching. An absolute substitution of the Saviour's obedience or sacrifice in the place of the suffering and obedience of His people is not taught in the Word of God The substitutionary idea is in their case qualified by that of representation on the one hand, and the mystical fellowship of His saints on the other. If unqualified at all, it is so with reference to the race at large or the world of mankind I. The purely vicarious quality of our Saviour's work refers only to the world or the race

Christ in His Person is the Son of man; and, as the new Adam, the Head and Summary of mankind, stands in the stead of all whom He represents. All that He is and does and suffers He is and does and suffers for the entire human family. Adam represented all, the multitude who were not in existence save in him; our Lord represented the same, who were not in existence save in Him. Before men were in being He assumed a universal relation to them, and that must have been strictly vicarious. The preposition anti, instead of, is used by our Lord in a saying which must rule all others: The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many;1 where the many are the all. St. Paul employs uper: If one died for all, then were all dead,2 or, rather, all died. Both, united and strengthened, are used by him again at the close of his teaching, in a sentence which condenses more of the substance of the doctrine than any other: For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus; who gave Himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time:3 anti lutron uper panton, both the word and the construction being unique in Greek literature. The idea of substitution is stamped deeply here; and in this its most forcible expression in the New Testament the vicarious universality is stated in three ways: the Person is MAN, for men; He is a ransom FOR ALL; and the context admits no limitation, as the intercession was demanded for all men, and of God Who willeth all men to be saved.4 1 Matthew 20:28; 2 2 Corinthians 5:14; 3 1 Timothy 2:5-6; 4 1 Timothy 2:4

II. Our Lord's vicarious relation to His people, subjectively receiving the Atonement, is modified by the two ideas of representation and the mystical personal union with Him

1. The former is current in the New Testament, which invariably represents Jesus as standing at the head of a fellowship of men for whose sake He has done and suffered all, that through His atoning mediation they might have access and hope. The doctrine is not that a penalty has been endured by Christ instead of His people; that He has occupied their legal place and borne their legal responsibility; and therefore that they are for ever discharged. It is rather that a sacrificial offering has been presented by Him instead of the race; and that He, making the virtue of His atonement the strength of His plea, represents all that come unto God by Him.1 The propitiation offered for all men, and accepted, becomes effectual only for the penitent who embraces it by trusting in Him Whom God hath set forth to be a Propitiation in His blood through faith.2 So also Christ appears in the presence of God for us,3 or on our behalf. His sacrificial obedience is not vicarious in the sense of discharging all its beneficiaries from obligation to do and suffer; for it was offered on behalf of the whole world,4 and they may perish for whom Christ died.5 1 Hebrews 7:25; 2 Romans 3:25; 3 Hebrews 9:24; 4 1 John 2:2; 5 1 Corinthians 8:11

2. The union of the believer with his Lord gives another qualification to the vicarious idea. Substitution pure and simple is inconsistent with the thought that the virtue of the Atonement is in any way dependent on personal participation with Christ by faith. But nothing is more certain than that His sacrifice is valid only for those who are mystically united with their Head in His death and resurrection. St. Paul says, not for himself only but for every believer, I am crucified with Christ . . . Who loved me, and gave Himself for me.1 And he habitually speaks of fellowship with the Savior in His death and resurrection, as making the general Atonement the individual possession. Now this union with Christ by faith does not mean, on the one hand, that the believer must add anything to the Supreme Expiation: that is a perversion which has been forced on the doctrine. But, on the other, it precludes the possibility of such a vicarious substitution as makes the atoning, work of Christ absolutely independent of, our relation to it. The propitiation in His blood is through faith;2 and this faith, uniting the soul to Christ, qualifies without impairing the truly vicarious character of His redeeming work 1 Galatians 2:20; 2 Romans 3:25 SCRIPTURAL PHRASEOLOGY

There are two Greek terms, or families of terms, on which hang the details of the doctrine just laid down: hilasmos and katallage are their representatives. The relations of these are clear and distinct in the original Scriptures; but they are to some extent confused in our present English translation

1. The former assumes three leading forms in the New Testament. Christ is the halismos, the virtue of the propitiation and the Propitiator: He is the Propitiation for our sins;1 not the hilasmor, because the process of His propitiating is lost in the effect. He is the living Expiation. He is also the hilasmrion, the Kapporeth, or Mercy-seat, according to the use of the word in the Septuagint: Whom God hath set forth to be a Propitiation,2 that is, as a mercy-seat, between Himself and sinners. Or, if the word be an adjective, then Thuma is understood, and He is a propitiatory sacrifice. As the High-priest He is said halaskesthas tas hamartias, that is, to expiate sins; a correct English translation gives this meaning: to make propitiation for the sins of the people.3 1 John 2:2; 2 Romans 3:25; 3 Hebrews 2:17

2. The latter is the word which is translated in the English version both by atonement and by reconciliation: the latter, however, is its strict meaning; or atonement, if this word retains its original sense AT-ONE-MENT. The verb katallassein signifies the virtue of the mediation of Christ as composing a difference between God and man, and katallagh the result: the new relation in which the world stands to God, He being no longer an antidikos, and the world being no more an object of wrath. The context in the two passages where the verb is used shows that God is the antagonist; of which more hereafter

3. Both these verbs have God for the Subject and not for the Object. The Supreme Being reconciles the world to Himself; it is not said that He is reconciled: this simply gives expression to the great truth that the whole provision for the re-establishment of peace is from above. God is reconciled to man, but in Christ who is Himself God: He therefore is the Reconciler while He is the Reconciled.1 So also the word expiate refers to an act of God: it is not said that He is propitiated, but that He propitiates Himself or brings Himself near by providing an expiation for the sin. Strictly speaking the atoning sacrifice declares a propitiation already in the Divine heart 1 2 Corinthians 5:19

4. A comparison of the two passages already referred to will illustrate this. In the one, We also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by Whom we have now received the Atonement,1 thn katallagoon, this last word ought to be rendered the Reconciliation. In the other, A merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people,2 hiláskesthai tás hamartías, ought to be rendered to make atonement for the sins. If the terms Atonement and Reconciliation changed places, in these passages, the meaning would be more clear. It may be observed, in connection with this, that there is a similar want of uniformity, as to the phraseology, in the English translation of the Old Testament. The expression lakapeer is the habitual technical term for the ceremonial covering of sin, as in this leading passage: For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have GIVEN it to you upon the altar to make an atonement FOR your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement IN the soul.2 Here three things already adverted to may be recalled. The atonement is given or appointed of God: His own Divine and eternal ordinance of canceling sin. Then, the life or soul in the blood, not the blood itself, makes the atonement. Finally, the atoning life covers the soul for which it avails. It is obvious that in this central passage sin is the object of the whole transaction. The reconciled or propitiated Jehovah displays His method of expiating transgression. But in some other passages the same verb is, as in the New Testament, translated by Reconcile; as if ton Theon were to be understood after hiláskesthai. One may be quoted which represents many: And when He hath made an end of reconciling the holy place,3 where the idea is that of applying the virtue of the atonement to the place which thus only can retain the indwelling Presence. A careful comparison of the Hebrew verb and noun with their equivalents in the Septuagint and the English Version will show that many accessory notions have been connected with them, such as Ransom, Cleansing, Satisfaction, Propitiation. But the fundamental thought remains that the Atonement is a Covering provided by God for the sinful and guilty soul of man 1 Hebrews 2:17; 2 Leviticus 17:11; 3 Leviticus 16:20 THEOLOGICAL MODIFICATIONS

There are certain modifications of those two leading terms which, both by inflection and addition, have been introduced into historical theology. These may be best studied in some of their mutual aspects

1. The specific idea of SATISFACTION has been added to that of EXPIATION. The former is in the court of law what the latter is in the temple. Reparation is made to the honor of the Lawgiver and the claims of the law in the suffering of Christ: and that is satisfaction. The atoning blood and life of the Victim covers the guilty soul so that its sin is not visited for punishment: and that is expiation. But the idea as referred to the Divine Being is really twofold: it is the satisfaction of His unutterable love which provides the atonement; and it is the satisfaction of His eternal holiness which must be a consuming fire to evil. Referred to the law, it is purely the endurance of its sentence or sanction, without which law is not law: this latter is the common theological meaning, but the former ought not to be forgotten. The word is not found in our Scriptures save once: Moreover ye shall take no satisfaction, koper, for the life of a murderer.1 There was no Levitical atonement for him, he shall be surely put to death. As commonly used to signify the unlimited reparation made for the dishonor done to the majesty of holiness by sin, it has no direct, though abundant indirect, sanction in the New Testament. But it evermore blends with the idea of propitiation: God is propitious, or favorably brought near, to the entire race of mankind: there is now but one anthroopoktónos, for whom eternal right shall take no satisfaction.2 And the

satisfaction offered in the sacrifice of Christ is a satisfaction of the Divine love before it is to be considered as a reparation to the Divine justice 1 Numbers 35:31-32; 2 John 8:44 2. Hence EXPIATION and PROPITIATION, one in Scripture, are theologically to be separated

Expiation refers the sacrifice to the sinner and the sin; Propitiation to the Supreme whose displeasure, not whose justice, —for justice cannot be propitiated, — is declared to be allayed. Both terms have a high and glorified meaning in Scripture as compared with secular phraseology and conceptions. Expiation requires sacrifice: a victim there must be; for this word, whether in heathenism or in revelation, belongs to temple ritual. Heathen expiations regarded only the blood and the vicarious death, which the guilty conscience of mankind has always vainly presented to appease the deities. Revealed expiation regards the life as in the blood: having always in view that sacrificial death which was offered by a Living Sacrifice. In one and the same symbol the death was suffered, the blood being sprinkled in token of that, and also the spotless life of the victim interposed between justice and the sinner, covering his person and his guilt. Propitiation, from PROPE, near, indicates in the Bible that the favor and good pleasure of God is attracted to the sinner by the mediation of Jesus. HE IS THE PROPITIATION1 because in Him God is nearer to man the sinner than even to man the unfallen. The fact, that holy wrath is turned away through the Atoning satisfaction is a secret behind the Incarnation: in the very essence of the Triune God. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son the Propitiation for our sins.2 The profound truth remains, that the Divine wrath and the Divine love are revealed at once in Christ, but love must have the pre-eminence in our phraseology 1 1 John 2:2; 2 1 John 4:10

3. The word ATONEMENT has undergone a certain change. In the New Testament it is rather a legal term, signifying the restoring of a pacified relation, katallagoo. But, as a theological and not a Biblical word, it returns from its New-Testament signification to that of the Old Testament. It expresses the Divine virtue of that mediatorial work which reconciles in God Himself love and holiness, justice and mercy: in God Himself, before the Reconciliation was exhibited in the world. Of the distinction between this Atonement eternally in God and Reconciliation in the world of time we must speak again. Suffice that the word in our current use testifies, not to the restoration of fellowship with God, but to the virtue of the Great Sacrifice through which that restoration is displayed or effected. We mean by THE ATONEMENT the whole economy of our Lord’s saving intervention as consummated on the cross. It is the ilasmos and ilaskesthas which answers to the koper and the kaper Just as we employ the term Redemption to designate Christ’s work as saving man generally; and the term Reconciliation to signify the ministry through which that salvation is proclaimed; so we use the term Atonement to include the virtue of the redeeming work as propitiating the Divine mercy to our race. In fact, it is the theological formula for all that belongs to that work

23. Vol 02 - The Atonement in its Results

The Atonement in its Results THE ATONEMENT IN ITS RESULTS: AS TO GOD; THE DIVINE GLORY

Divine Name Divine Attributes Divine Righteousness Views of Atonement in Scripture as Satisfaction in God

Love to Man Display of Righteousness AS TO GOD AND MAN; RECONCILIATION God Reconciler and Reconciled Reconciliation of World or Human Nature Personal Reconciliation AS TO MAN; REDEMPTION From what—Sin, Satan, and Death By what—the Price To Whom and by Whom offered For whom—Universal Particular Application HISTORY OF DOGMA

Ante-Nicene Gnostics and Satan’s place in the Doctrine

Pre-Anselmic Greek and Latin Teaching

Anselm

Cur Deus Homo Controversies of Schoolmen

Tridentine The Reformation Socinianism and Rationalism Grotian and Arminian

General Results

Having viewed the Atonement as presented by Christ, its virtue or merit expiating sin and satisfying the claims of Divine justice and love, we must now regard it in its effect as an accomplished act. The result of the One Offering is represented in Scripture in its relation to God, to God and man, and to man. As to God, it is the final saving manifestation of His glory; as to God and man, it is the Reconciliation; as to man more particularly, it is Redemption. These, however, are only different aspects of one and the same Atonement, which are distinguished, though not systematically distinguished, in the New Testament AS TO GOD: THE DIVINE GLORY IN REDEMPTION In the finished work of Christ, the Name, Attributes and Government of God are most fully exhibited and glorified. The Triune Name is made known; the Love and Righteousness of God have their highest and best manifestation, as the expression of the Divine will; and the Moral Government of the Supreme is supremely vindicated THE TRIUNE NAME The name of the Triune God is especially made known and therefore glorified in the mediation of the Incarnate Redeemer. The revelation of the Trinity is bound up with the revelation of redemption; the development of one was the development of .the other, and both were perfected together. The Son, addressing the Father a prayer which regards the Atonement as accomplished, declares: I have manifested Thy name unto the men which Thou gavest Me out of the world.1 This can refer only to the disclosure of that new name of Father which the incarnation and teaching of the Son had made manifest. Not long before He had said: Father, glorify Thy name;2 when the response was given: I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again. His own name as the Son was now for the first time made known: Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in Him.3 Only in

the Son is the Father revealed; and there is no Son revealed save in redemption. Hence the Saviour's prayer asks that the mutual glorification of the Father and the Son may be complete: Father, the hour is come; glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son also may glorify Thee.4 And this must be interpreted in the light of the preceding discourse, which shows that the full disclosure of the name of the Son, here prayed for, must await the manifestation of a Third Name, that of the Holy Ghost. The Divine Spirit is the Revealer both of the Father and the Son; and on the day of Pentecost the eternal mystery of the Trinity was fully made known: God reserved His pro-foundest revelation of Himself for the Finished Atonement. Our Lord pronounced The Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost5 only after His resurrection. The mystery of His perfect love unfolded the mystery of His perfect essence. But this subject has been already discussed under the Mediatorial Trinity 1 John 17:6; 2 John 12:28; 3 John 13:31 4 John 17:1; 5 Matthew 28:19 THE DIVINE ATTRIBUTES The attributes of God are glorified both singly and unitedly, and in a transcendent manner, by the mediation of the Incarnate. This indeed is included in the meaning of the prayer that the Name of God might be glorified in His Son; for that Name is not only the Triune Name, but the assemblage of the Divine perfections. Throughout the Old Testament and the New the Divine glories, especially those which we may in this connection call the glories of the moral attributes, are condensed over the mercy-seat: receiving from it their highest illustration. There is a gradational display of the eternal majesty. The heavens declare the glory of God,1 while the whole earth is full of His glory.2 Again, in Judah is God known:3 His Name is great in Israel, but it is Israel's Temple which His train filled. And the Temple itself is filled only with the diffusive radiance: it was in the Holiest that He appeared in the cloud upon the mercy-seat.4 The perfect revelation of the Triune God in the Incarnate Son of the Godhead has presented the Divine Attributes in a new aspect, and to mortal man they will never otherwise be known. God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.5 And in the New Testament it is obvious that with scarcely an exception every reference to the combined or individual perfections of God refers to their exhibition in the work of Christ. At least, all other allusions lead up to this. Not to repeat what has already been made prominent under the Divine Attributes, it may suffice to mention the new and perfect revelation of the holiness and love of God as disclosed in the Atonement 1 Psalms 19:1; 2 Isaiah 6:3; 3 Psalms 76:1; 4 Leviticus 16:2; 5 2 Corinthians 4:6

1. The latter here has the pre-eminence. Never is the love of God, absolutely, connected with the works of creation, or with the general dispensations of Providence. Over them loving kindness reigns, but Divine charity is reserved for the Atonement. It gives a new name to the nature of God: GOD is LOVE. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the Propitiation for our sins,1 where we may omit to be 1 1 John 4:8; 1 John 4:10

2. The Divine HOLINESS is exhibited as conspicuously as the Divine love, so far as concerns the process of redemption: love is supreme in the origination, and will be supreme at the end—for mercy rejoiceth against judgment,1 not over it, though over against it— but in the actual atoning work the justice of holiness, demanding the punishment and extermination of sin, is displayed in the most awful manner of which the human mind can form any conception

1 James 2:13

3. It is important to remember that Holy Scripture never makes such a distinction between the love and the holiness of God as theology thinks it necessary to establish. The mercy that provides and the justice that requires the Atonement are one in the recesses of the Divine nature. Their union or identity is lost to us in the thick darkness of the light which we cannot approach. The cross of Christ, or rather the whole mediation of the Redeemer, equally and at once reveals both. Herein is love—to quote once more the final revelation of Scripture on this subject—not that we loved God but that He loved us, and sent His Son the Propitiation for our sins.1 In our infirmity we find it needful to correct our estimate of one attribute by appealing to the other. The Scripture scarcely condescends to that infirmity. It speaks of the Divine agápee2 as ordering the whole economy of what is nevertheless an hilasmós or propitiation, and of the Divine eudokia3 as ordering the whole economy of what is nevertheless a hoú nún teén katallagoo. We shall hereafter see how these four words meet in the sacrifice of the cross, where love reigns through the infinite sacrifice of love 1 1 John 4:10; 2 1 John 4:10; 3 Colossians 1:19

4. But it is the glory and unity of all the attributes that the work of Christ exhibits in their perfection. There is nothing that belongs to our conception of the Divine nature which is not manifested in His Son, Who both in His active and in His passive righteousness reveals all that is in the Father. Man, in fact, knows God only as a God of redemption; nor will He ever by man be otherwise known. Throughout the Scriptures of truth we have a gradual revelation of the Divine Being which is not finished until it is finished in Christ: God also, as well as man, is en autoó pepleerooménoi, COMPLETE IN HIM. It is not enough to say that the Trinity Whom Christians adore is made known in Jesus, and that this or the other attribute which theology ascribes to Him is illustrated in His work. God Himself, with every idea we form of His nature, is given to us by the revelation of Christ. The gracious and awful Being Who is presented in the Christian Scriptures is not in all respects such a Deity as human reason would devise or tolerate when presented. But to us there is but ONE GOD; and we must receive Him, as He is made known to us through the mystery of the Atoning Mediation of His Son. His Name is proclaimed only in the Cross; there we have His Divine and only Benediction; and every Doxology in Revelation derives its strength and fervor from the Atonement THE DIVINE GOVERNMENT The Government of the Supreme Ruler of the universe is perfectly vindicated by the Atonement. This effect of the work of Christ is much dwelt upon by St. Paul; and is perhaps the most obvious and comprehensible view of it which can be taken. It gives its coloring to a large portion of the New-Testament phraseology; especially, however, to the recorded Discourses and the leading Epistle of that Apostle

1. There are three views of the Atonement in Scripture. It is sometimes regarded as the result of a mystery that had been transacted in the Divine mind before its manifestation in time. Sometimes, again, it is exhibited as a demonstration of God’s love to mankind, and self-sacrifice in Christ for their sake: as it were to move the hearts of men with hatred of sin and desire to requite so much mercy. Strictly speaking, this is not given as an explanation of the Atonement: the New Testament does not sanction the idea that our Lord’s self-sacrifice is made an argument with sinners. It is never so used. Certainly, God commendeth His love toward us;1 but here St. Paul is exhorting Christians, already saved, to rely upon the abundant provision of grace for the future which is guaranteed by the demonstration of love in the past. Everywhere the love of God, whether the Father or the Son, in the Atonement is used as a most mighty argument of self-devotion, severity of morals, tenderness to man, and universal, boundless charity. It is never employed to melt the

heart of a sinner: certainly that object is nowhere given as an explanation of Christ's work. And, lastly, it is set forth as an expedient for upholding the dignity of the Ruler of the universe and Administrator of law. These three views, or, to use modern language, theories of the Atonement are combined in the Scriptures: neither is dwelt upon apart from the rest. The perfect doctrine includes them all. Every error springs from the exaggeration of one of these elements at the expense of the others

1 Romans 5:8

2. St. Paul, in the Epistle which treats most fully of the universal moral government of God, thus makes the last of the three emphatic, while expressly or by inference including the two others. He carries the doctrine into the court of justice

(1.) The Evangelical method of saving and making men righteous is called the Righteousness of God. It is said to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God:1 that is, to make His righteousness appear, by a retrospective interpretation of its ways, consistent with its passing over or pretermission, dia ton paresin, of sins in past ages. This vindicates the rectoral government of God, based upon one and the same method of righteousness, FOR THE PAST of the preparatory economy, whether of Gentiles or Jews. To declare, 1say, at this time His righteousness; that He might be just, and the Justifier of him which believeth in Jesus: that is, it enables Him to treat a sinner as a righteous man, and yet be Himself just in so regarding him This vindicates the rectoral government of God, FOR THE PRESENT, of the Christian fullness of time. Afterwards, with reference to this same Gospel system, we read: Ye have I obeyed from the heart that form of teaching to which you were delivered. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness.2 That is, the Atonement insures the honor of the law after forgiveness. This vindicates the rectoral government of God, FOR THE FUTURE, both as to the race and the individual. The leading characteristic of this passage, therefore, is the vindication of God's rectoral character: the protection of law in the presence of the universe. Here is the truth of what is sometimes, but needlessly, called the Grotian or Governmental theory 1 Romans 3:21-26; 2 Romans 6:17-18

(2.) The words justified freely through His grace,1grace displayed in the Atonement as affectingly appealing to man, may be so interpreted as to lay the foundation of what is occasionally termed the theory of Moral Influence. If they are taken out of the context, and considered alone, they declare that the redeeming plan is the free expression of the Divine grace; which, however, found it expedient to exhibit in the sufferings of the Righteous Jesus the evil of sin and the glory of self-sacrificing zeal for its destruction

Apart from the perversion of these words, which regards them as standing alone, they do proclaim the supremacy of love and of grace in the whole economy of redemption

Whatever our salvation cost the Redeemer, it is in all its history and its issues the expression of free grace to us. The theory, not thus standing alone, is true

1 Romans 3:24 (3.) The words are connected with others: they refuse to be eliminated from the context The unique expression which follows and represents the Redeemer as the Propitiatory or Mercy-seat—to be a propitiation in His blood through faith1makes it most sure that there was a necessity for the Atonement in the Divine Nature. The Blood was not shed only as the life of one

who renounced all for the good of others. It was not the life-blood of selfsacrifice only. It was the blood of propitiation; and this word for ever turns to the innermost recesses of the Divine nature. Man's heart is to be moved only because the heart of God was moved. This links St. Paul's with St. John's testimony in his First Epistle. There the ascendancy is given to Love; but this only renders more impressive the necessity of the atoning sacrifice. Herein is LOVE, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the PROPITIATION for our sins.2 1 Romans 3:25; 2 1 John 4:10 AS TO GOD AND MAN: THE RECONCILIATION The New-Testament term Reconciliation—or, as it sometimes occurs, Atonement— defines the Finished Work as having effected and exhibited the restoration of fellowship between God and man. The change of relation is mutual: God lays aside His displeasure against mankind, being propitiated in the intervention of His Son; and all men, through the ministry of the Reconciliation, are invited to enter into a state of acceptance with God, laying aside their enmity. The former belongs to the work of Christ as a decree of heaven fulfilled on earth; the latter belongs to the same work as finished on earth and pleaded in heaven, in the provision made for individual acceptance. The reconciliation, therefore, is a process accomplished in two senses: first, the Supreme Judge is reconciled to the race absolutely; secondly, provision is made for the reconciliation of all men individually to Him GOD THE RECONCILER AND THE RECONCILED

God is the Reconciler in the Atonement inasmuch as He provides the sacrifice which propitiates Himself: the very existence or possibility of the sacrifice proves Him to be already propitiated. But this does not exclude His being the Reconciled: indeed, so far as concerns the great change declared in or wrought by the interposition of the Mediator, it is God alone who is reconciled. The removal of the enmity in the sinner follows the great reconciliation, and is its secondary effect. Here there are two opposite errors to be guarded against

1. Holy Scripture does not encourage the thought that the actual sacrificial obedience of Christ reconciled God, previously hostile, to man; nor that the atonement offered on the cross wrought as a cause the effect of modifying the intention of the Divine mind towards the human race. The purpose of redemption was an eternal purpose: change must be wrought in time. Our Lord was sent to declare a reconciliation with sinning human nature preceding and presupposing the sin that needed it; which was, indeed, no other than the reconciliation of the mercy of love and the justice of holiness in the Divine nature itself through the Incarnation rendered possible by the adorable mystery of the Three Persons in the Godhead. This is always and consistently declared in the New Testament, which makes the method of atonement simply and only a product of the Divine counsel. His purpose, His righteousness, His love are severally regarded as the originating principle But always the overture and act of reconciliation is from Him. God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.1 1 2 Corinthians 5:19 2. The other error is that of those who insist that the only reconciliation is of man to God

It is a very superficial, and it might be added sentimental, feeling that leads to this assertion: the opposite would, as we have seen, be nearer the truth, as will be further evident from the following considerations concerning the ideas presented to us in the Scriptures which speak on the subject, and the consistent phraseology adopted for the expression of these ideas

(1.) He who offers the reconciliation yields His righteous claims, as it were, before they are enforced; and, instead of enforcing them, beseeches men to be reconciled to Him. But all Divine

claims—to repeat a word which theology reluctantly uses—have been in the presuppositions of the atoning work satisfied. The word seems to look only to man, but its face is turned towards God also. Not to betake ourselves to abstract principles, the Scripture must be our appeal. The few sentences containing that aspect of the Saviour's work which views it as the Reconciliation speak in their context of a Divine wrath, and in such a way as to give wrath its uttermost meaning. In the classical Corinthian passage we read not imputing their trespasses unto them,1which has behind it, or rather before it, that most solemn declaration, Who, though He knew not sin, was MADE SIN for us.2These last words give the key to the whole doctrine: closing the statement of it with deep emphasis 1 2 Corinthians 5:19; 2 2 Corinthians 5:21

(2.) A due regard to the habitual use of the term will lead to the same conclusion. We may fairly collate the Lord's word, first be reconciled to thy brother,1 which is a strict parallel in meaning, though the word diallágeethi is not precisely the same: it is the offended brother who is really propitiated. So too in the case of the Philistines and David: wherewith should he reconcile himself unto his master?2 it was the master and not David that was to be appeased. The verb katallassein is never used of the Atonement in the Old Testament; but there are a few texts in the Apocrypha which prepare for its subsequent use. For instance: they besought the merciful Lord to be reconciled with His servants

Though the New Testament does not speak of God as being reconciled, the meaning is precisely the same as in this and similar passages. The eternal God, however, it must be repeated, was reconciled before Christ came to display His saving grace: He only brought the reconciliation, which we receive. There was in heaven an Atonement before the Atonement 1 Matthew 5:24; 2 1 Samuel 29:4 THE RECONCILIATION The Reconciliation is a change of relation between God and mankind, or the human race, or the nature of man. It is true that inspired phraseology does not use these abstract terms; but it says that

God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself:1 where een katallassoon, combined with mee logizomenos, indicates that the Father in the Son was and is always carrying out a purpose of grace: the eternal decree was accomplished in Christ on the cross; it is always in course of accomplishment. It is the former which een suggests, as compared with epoieesen afterwards, He made sin for us: the wrath of God against our transgression was expended upon our Representative, and diverted from us

He reconciled the world to Himself by removing from it, as a world, His eternal displeasure. What is now going on through the ministry is the winning of individual souls to the enjoyment of the Divine peace. For the full interpretation of this classical passage it is necessary to consider more distinctly the meaning of both terms: Reconciliation and World 1 2 Corinthians 5:19

1. The entire world of mankind God is said to have reconciled to Himself in Christ, inasmuch as the atoning sacrifice was the actual realization of a purpose which had been regarded as wrought out from the beginning of human history. An economy or relation of peace had always prevailed in His government of a sinful race. The term may be said to characterize the kind of administration the Supreme Ruler has exercised over a guilty race. St. Paul shows this when he says, We also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by Whom we have now received the Atonement,1 or the reconciliation, which here is simply equivalent to the grace of redemption. The Reconciliation is a title of the work of Christ, just as the words Grace and Gospel and Righteousness give it their

names. As the world has received a Savior or Deliverer, and the Gospel is preached to the world, so the world has from the beginning had the benefit of the amnesty. But a dispensation of forbearance BEFORE Christ is IN Christ a dispensation of perfect Peace. Hence the Gospel is called the ministry of reconciliation.2 God is administering, through the stewards of this mystery, a system or economy of forgiveness and peace. The ambassadors of Christ announce a general declaration of the Divine good will to the world. Their ministry is not so much to induce sinners to lay aside their opposition to God as to persuade them that God has laid aside His opposition to them, not imputing their trespasses.3 They are representatives of Christ's work as the expression of the Father's will. For it pleased the Father that in Him should all fullness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of His Cross, by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself:4 these last two clauses may well be inverted; the reconciliation is not the sequel of the making peace, but the making peace itself. There is nothing said here of a reconciliation between the upper intelligences and man, or between both united and God: it is evident that the Atonement is a ground of amnesty in the Divine government universal, so far only as the human race is concerned The Cross belongs to the world, and to all the world. Its two arms stretch backward and forward, to the beginning and to the end of time. So it is in a parallel place: For He is our Peace . . . that He might reconcile both unto God in one body by the Cross, having slain the enmity thereby:5 what enmity He slew is explained by the reconciliation UNTO GOD The result is that the life of salvation reigns 1 Romans 5:11; 2 2 Corinthians 5:18; 3 2 Corinthians 5:19; 4 Colossians 1:19-20; 5 Ephesians 2:14-16

2. There is another sense in which the world of mankind is reconciled or restored in Christ: the human family is really represented by that part of it which lives spiritually in its New Head. Undoubtedly there will be, as there has been and still is a portion of the descendants of Adam unrestored to God. While the race in its unity is, notwithstanding sin, placed in a relation of peace with the Supreme Ruler, so that the holy heavens can still canopy an unholy earth, that peace, with regard to the world as such, is after all only the provision and possibility of peace. And yet God may be said to have saved mankind; or rather mankind is restored to fellowship with Him, and to that communion which was so soon suspended in Paradise. The angels, or the inhabitants of other regions of the Divine government, would say that man was saved, that things in earth1 were reconciled and set right: indeed, they did once say it, on earth Peace.2 The solution is, that those who refuse the great Reconciliation are cast out as not belonging to the human race. That Body which is the Church, of which Christ is the head, is the new and reconciled humanity. Hence the blood of His Cross is the medium by which the good pleasure of the Father restores His human prodigal; thus doth He devise means that His banished be not expelled from Him:3 those who remain outcasts, after the Atonement is exhausted, being not reckoned as among the living. We cannot be sure that the lost spirits have rejected anything corresponding to our redemption. But as it respects our deliverance, St. Paul tells us that the effect of the Cross is an accomplished reconciliation, in which God is well pleased, and which is not marred by the reprobation of the lost. Taking up again the passage already quoted, it was by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself; by Him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven:4 here the all things are only human things, or things in heaven as they are related to man on earth. So in the Epistle to the Hebrews we read: It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves, with better sacrifices than these.5 This last passage is really the interpretation of the mysterious Colossian sentence just quoted 1 Colossians

1:20; 2 Luke 2:14; 3 2 Samuel 14:14; 4 Colossians 1:20; 5 Hebrews 9:23

3. What has been said will make it evident that the individual reconciliation to God is no other than the personal assumption of the benefit of the general reconciliation. The peace established between God and man by the work of Christ is the basis for the personal acceptance of the believer into the favor of God and all its blessed consequences. Our being reconciled never means our putting away our enmity, but the revelation in us of God's mercy. This is evident in the Apostle's words to the Romans: For if, when we were enemies,1 under the displeasure of God, echthroi ontes, we were reconciled to God, kateellágeemen toó Theoó, by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, having become partakers of Divine grace, we shall be saved by His life. He is our Peace,2 St Paul says, just as He is our Savior, our Lord, our Head. And those who have received the Atonement, or who are justified by His blood—that is, who do not reject the reconciliation which is announced to them in the Gospel—have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.3 The preachers of the Gospel declare the message of their embassy, and beseech men in Christ's stead: Be ye reconciled to God.4 But they mean only: Submit yourselves to the mercy of Heaven. St. Paul gives another expression to the same truth: he adds, And came and preached peace;5 after that description of the Atonement, already quoted, which speaks of His having slain the enmity on the cross. When the Reconciliation is received in penitent faith it becomes the state and life of righteousness; and a new order of terms is introduced with which future Sections will make us more familiar 1 Romans 5:10; 2 Ephesians 2:14; 3 Romans 5:1; Romans 5:9; Romans 5:11; 4 2 Corinthians 5:18-20; 5 Ephesians 2:16-17 AS TO MAN: REDEMPTION The term which is most often used, used in the widest variety of applications, and most impressively connected with man as the beneficiary of the Atonement, is Redemption This exhibits the work of Christ as the laying down of a ransom-price for the legitimate and effectual deliverance of mankind from the bondage of the law of sin. Like the reconciliation, redemption is objective and subjective: objectively, the race is redeemed; and provision is made for the subjective deliverance of individual man from the sentence of the law, the power of sin, and all the consequences of transgression. Hence redemption is both universal and partial or limited. But in every case it is man who is redeemed; while God alone is glorified, and God and man are reconciled

Redemption once for all effected on the cross, and redemption now in process, are described by the same terms. Those terms may be arranged in four classes: first, those in which the lutron, or ransom-price, is included; secondly, those which mean purchase generally, such as agorazein; thirdly, those which imply only release, as from luein; and, lastly, those which indicate the notion of forcible rescue, ruesthai. It will be obvious that, as we are now discussing the Atonement in relation to the finished work of Christ alone, the first of these classes belongs more strictly than the rest to our present subject Sometimes the distinction is expressed as redemption by price and redemption by power This is a beautiful and true distinction; though it is well to be on our guard against too sharply distinguishing these two, whether in the Lord's external work or in the believer's internal experience of it. We must now, however, limit ourselves to the objective Atonement mainly. Although it will be impossible altogether to exclude the personal application, that will come more appropriately under the Administration of Redemption

It must be remembered that, whatever secondary meanings the term may have, redemption is the deliverance of mankind from bondage. The treatment of the subject will perhaps be more effectual

by considering and answering five questions. What is the bondage from which the race is redeemed? What is the price paid down for that redemption? To Whom and by Whom is it offered? For whom is it effectual? What are the general results of that redemption? But the answer of these questions presupposes the previous discussion of the Atonement generally, and must needs to some extent involve repetition THE BONDAGE OF SIN

Mankind, as the object of redemption, is ransomed from captivity to sin, primarily; subordinately and indirectly, from captivity to Satan and to death the penalty of sin

1. Sin holds man in bondage both as a condemnation and as a power. (1.) The condemnation is the curse of the law.1 As the strength of sin is the law,2 so the strength of the law is sin. It binds every moral creature to perfect obedience; and, that being found wanting, it shuts the transgressor up to the sentence of doom from which, so far as the legal ordinance goes, there is no release. (2.) Sin is an internal power in human nature: enslaving the will, and affections, and mind. (3.) The atoning intervention of Christ has put away sin3 as an absolute power in human life. He hath obtained eternal redemption for us: an objective, everlasting, all-sufficient redemption from the curse of the law, and from the necessary surrender of the will to the power of evil 1 Galatians 3:13; 2 1 Corinthians 15:56; 3 Hebrews 9:26; Hebrews 9:12

2. Satan and death are subordinate but real representatives of that power of evil: subordinate; for they are only ministers of sin, which might retain its empire if they did not exist. (1.) Satan is the executioner of the Divine sentence, and the prince of all evil: in the former relation he represents the condemnation of the law; in the latter the interior bondage to iniquity. (2.) Death also, as a sentence of severance from God, holds man in bondage only as another form of the curse of the law. As temporal death, it is, like him who has the power of death, a ruler under sin. (3.) From these, the subordinates and representatives of the great captivity, redemption has made provision to set man free. The Epistle to the Hebrews connects this truth with the Atonement in a remarkable manner

All is said in a paragraph which is rounded by these words: That He by the grace of God should taste death for everyMan 1:1 and to make propitiation for the sins of the people

Here are the beginning and end of the mystery of redemption of Christ, the expiatory death. Intermediately we read, That through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage: Satan is brought to naught, and death ceases to be a terror, when sin is atoned for and abolished as an external and as an internal empire 1 Hebrews 2:9-17 THE RANSOM-PRICE The lutron, or ransom-price paid down, is the Blood, or the Life, or the Self of Christ; and it is important to ask how this is connected with man’s deliverance

1. The term in classical Greek, and in the Septuagint, is in the plural, meaning the money paid down for ransom of a captive; but this for an obvious reason is in the singular when applied to the Great Redeemer. (1.) The Lord’s words give the only instance of its use as a noun: The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many,1 teen psucheen auto lutron anti polloon. It could not be interpreted by those who heard it otherwise than as the lutra peri psuchees of the Septuagint: Ye shall take no satisfaction for the life.2 But Christ’s LIFE was one satisfaction for all offenders, and for every kind of offence summed up in one, (2.) St

Paul speaks of the BLOOD of our Redeemer as the ransom-price, turning the noun into a verb: the Church of the Lord, which He hath purchased with His own blood.3 These words the Apostle varied in writing to the same Ephesian elders: in whom we have redemption through His blood. So St. Peter: ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers, but with the precious blood of Christ.4 And St. John: Thou wast slain, and didst purchase to God.5 (3.) The last testimony of St. Paul adds a third term, Who gave Himself a ransom for all: HIMSELF, His Divine-human Person, identifying the offering with the Divine-human Person Himself, as St. John does when he says He is the Propitiation.6 The ever-blessed Substitute lays down His life, which is in His blood, but the life of the God-man, both as dead and as ever living, in the stead of all men, and especially for His own people 1 Matthew 20:28; 2 Num. 35:31. 3 Acts 20:28; 4 Ephesians 1:7; 5 1 Peter 1:18-19; 6 1 John 2:2

2. The precise connection between the ransom-price and man's salvation is variously exhibited in Scripture. There can be no doubt that the words are figurative, and cannot altogether express the nature of that great deliverance which they refer to. The redemptional terms, like the ceremonial system, serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things:1 faintly reflecting the eternal reality. They define the salvation of man generally, but in a variety of ways: as ransom of a captive, payment of a debt, dissolution of a power, rescue from an enemy, disenthralment from systems of error and vain conversation, and in other ways. But it would be wrong to say that the language is only figurative. It expresses a most important double truth, each side of which rests upon the infinite value of the price paid down: first, the negative rescue from wrath; secondly, the positive recovery into the hands of God in Christ. These must be considered in their order and connection

1 Hebrews 8:5

(1.) The ransom-price is satisfaction of the claims of Divine justice, and redemption is release provided for the race. Our Deliverer took the place of the captive: being made sin for us1 and a curse for us.2 Hence the ideas of ransom and atonement melt into one; as in the Old Testament the lutron is exilasma.3 Note in the New Testament two passages in which St. Paul remarkably blends the two ideas, Through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation.4 Here the price is carried into the temple, and is laid on the altar; and with these words may be compared, In Whom we have redemption [through His blood], even the forgiveness of sins,5 where a third idea is added: the redemption price, offered in sacrificial blood, secures the pardon of offences

St. Peter's conjunction is similar, Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, . . . but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot,6 with the addition of the sacrificial victim. Finally the Epistle to the Hebrews may be compared: by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption;7 in which words yet another truth is added, that the price is carried into the heavens to be reckoned there for ever

1 2 Corinthians 5:21; 2 Galatians 3:13; 3 Psalms 49:8; 4 Romans 3:24-25; 5 Colossians 1:14; 6 1 Peter 1:18-19; 7 Hebrews 9:12

(2.) The Redeemer in the Christian doctrine recovers for Himself what He rescues. This is the transcendent peculiarity of the idea. Christ does not ransom us in such a sense as to release and

let us go simply: He ransoms us back into His own rights over us as God; and this explains the connection between the sacrificial and the regal office. The Redeemer, approaching His altar, prays: Glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son also may glorify Thee:1 as Thou hast given Him power over all flesh: the power of a Deliverer over the purchase of His own ransom-price. For, the Savior of mankind died and lived in order that He might be Lord both of the dead and living.2 Hence, more particularly, the mediatorial rescue is the restoration to man of the Holy Spirit, His forfeited inheritance as created for communion with God. Our Savior is the God-Redeemer of the Old Testament. He buys back our inheritance, positively, as well as releases us from bondage, negatively. The two are in St. Paul's sentence; Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.3 But this revolves into the old and familiar dual blessing of the Christian covenant. Redemption provides for the release from condemnation; and it secures the bestowment of a renewing Spirit 1 John 17:1-2; 2 Rom. 19:9; 3 Galatians 3:13-14

(3.) The word therefore as expressing the effect of the Atonement is not limited strictly to release from captivity and restoration to lost privileges. The general idea of the lutron sometimes recedes, and a class of terms is used which signify rescue, or deliverance, or payment of a debt, or canceling of a bond. It should be remembered, however, that these have reference rather to the administration of redemption than to redemption itself. As to our Saviour's own finished work, once for all accomplished, it is always the laying down a price for the ransom of the world. St. Paul, in one remarkable passage, declares that our Lord cancelled our human debt and suspended the legal document which attested it to His cross: a view which stands alone here in Scripture. The Apostle is speaking primarily of the annihilation by Christ of the documents of the covenant that sundered the Jew and the Gentile; but the words have a larger meaning and give a most impressive illustration of our redemption generally: Blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross.1 This passage is of a certain class of unique illustrations of the central fact: they should be sparingly used in theological exposition, however useful in practical application 1 Colossians 2:14 REDEMPTION A DIVINE TRANSACTION This has anticipated the third question, or virtually answered it: to Whom and by Whom was the ransomed offered? 1. The redemption of mankind is altogether a Divine transaction, in its origin, in its method, and in its results. (1.) In its origin: the mystery of our rescue was hid in the Deity before it was disclosed to man; the Love of the Triune God is its source, the Justice of the Triune God is its necessity, and the Wisdom of the Triune God is its law. (2.) In its method: the work of our accomplished deliverance as a race is altogether wrought of God: but of Him in the mediatorial revelation of the Trinity. What behind the veil which hides the Triune is one, to us appears three-one. The Father is God Who sends His Son; the Son is God Who takes our nature that in it He may redeem us; the Holy Ghost is God, Who orders the process of our salvation from the alpha to the omega. (3.) In its results: the acceptance of the ransom-price of mankind is the accomplishment of a Divine Purpose, which needed nothing out of God for its attainment, and by nothing out of God could be frustrated. It was a Divine act, and the Divine Will needs no help or concurrence, as no other power could thwart or arrest its execution till its consent was previously given. Hence the Trinity is the Author of a necessary salvation, an ETERNAL REDEMPTION.

1 The price was laid up in the eternal treasury for future use in time

1 Hebrews 9:12 2. The light of this truth detects many errors that may be here briefly anticipated.

(1.) There is no discord in the Divine nature, no conflict of interests between the Persons of the Holy Trinity. The Eternal Son does not propitiate an anger in the Father which He does not Himself share; nor does the Eternal Father represent a holy justice in the Divine nature which is to be satisfied by an atoning love only found in the Son; nor does the Eternal Spirit witness a covenant that solves a discord in which He has no part. The Second and the Third Persons of the Holy Trinity have a several personality which in their adorable mystery renders the Atonement possible. But beyond that our reverence permits us to say nothing.

(2.) The Enemy of man has no necessary part in the transaction. From the beginning of post-apostolical theology onward to Bernard a strange notion of Satan's rights disturbed men's minds, which vanished when the Atonement was studied, as it were, first in the hidden recesses of the Divine nature.

(3.) Nestorianism, with every modern phase of it that makes the redemption of man's nature in Christ an experiment, is banished from our doctrine. The redemption obtained in time was an eternal redemption: it was a predestined salvation of the human race: for ever, 0 Lord, Thy word is settled in heaven.1

(4.) Every theory that opposes or perverts the freeness of God's grace is without support. There are two in particular, which include every variety of its many forms: no human merit can have place in a scheme which was settled on man's behalf in eternal mercy, and there can be no help for man apart from a redeeming economy. Grace and deliverance have the same eternal foundations

1 Psalms 119:89 UNIVERSALITY OF REDEMPTION The Price was paid down for all men for the entire race, or for the entire nature of man in all its representatives from the first transgressor to the last. Redemption as such is UNIVERSAL; or it is general, as distinguished from the Special Redemption of the individual

1. This blessed truth is a priori the anticipation of reason, and answers to the expectation which might be entertained, and has been entertained, by the mind of man supposed to be made aware of the fact of a Divine intervention. Of course this is only a preliminary argument; and if it should be proved that the Word of God contradicts the universal instinct, it must be given up. But the Word of God does not contradict this profound sentiment of humanity

(1.) It is the true instinct of man that he belongs to a race which is one in its origin and destination: one whether in ruin or in recovery; both in its fall and in its redemption

(2.) The God of mankind must by the very terms be supposed to be a God of philanthropy and to love the race as such which He created. He gave us our existence, whether as a family or as individuals, unasked: will He cut us off without hope after we have fallen, or reserve His salvation for a few? Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?1 In answer to this increated instinct, His Revealer tells us that God so loved the world that He gave His Only-begottenSong of Solomon 2:1-17 and that He is the living God, Who is the Savior of all men,3 His saving grace to all men hath appeared, after having been comparatively unrevealed until its due time, and that it is the kindness and love of God our Savior towardsMan 1:4 or His PHILANTHROPY. This last word

refuses limitation 1 Genesis 18:25; 2 John 3:16; 3 1 Timothy 4:10; 4 Titus 3:4

(3.) The object of the redeeming intervention of such a Being as the God-man cannot be limited without again doing violence to our instinctive expectation. We should take it for granted that so glorious a Person would not be sent on a partial and limited errand; that, supposing Him to visit this earth, He would embrace its whole compass in His mission; and the testimonies concerning Christ confirm this. He is the Mediator of God and men, the Jesus-Man 1:1 He is the Lost Adam and the Second Man;2 and the only time He spoke of His soul as a ransom He called Himself the Son ofMan 1:3 Where it is said that, to deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage, He took on Him the seed of Abraham,4 this is opposed to the angels in the same verse, to whom He did not stretch out His helping hand, and in a preceding verse it is explained by flesh and blood: He is the seed of David, which is the seed of Abraham, which is the seed of the woman. He Who made OF one blood all the nations of men5 hath also BY one blood redeemed all nations of men 1 1 Timothy 2:5; 2 1 Corinthians 15:45-47; 3 Matthew 20:28; 4 Hebrews 2:15-16; 5 Acts 17:26 2. The positive assertions of Scripture are few, but very forcible

(1.) Directly, it is said that Christ Jesus gave Himself a ransom far all.1 And the force of this testimony is if possible strengthened by the context, containing the exhortation to pray for all men, which is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior, Who willeth all men to be saved, because He is the one God who deals with men through one Mediator We read that this Mediator descended below the angels that He by the grace of God should taste death for everyMan 1:2uper pantos: this last word does not mean for every creature, but certainly for every man. The Forerunner bids us all Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world:3 his new word airei, taketh away, is half expiatory, half redemptional, but altogether universal. (2.) Indirectly, many passages require this as inference. Even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction:4 parallel with St. Paul’s Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died,5 but still more evidently bringing in the substitutionary price. Other illustrations are so numerous that they cannot be quoted in full, and need no specimens: such as all the declarations of God’s love to the world, all the general proclamations of repentance and the Gospel as glad tidings, the foreannouncement of the resurrection of all men as the result of redemption, and those texts which make man chargeable with his own doom. But the most impressive of these indirect assertions are such as invest the Redeemer with attributes and relations to the world which know no restriction: He is the Light of the world, the Life universally, and the Lord of all. It is however the glory of this argument that it needs not the support of individual texts 1 1 Timothy 2:6; 2 Hebrews 2:9; 3 John 1:29; 4 2 Peter 2:1; 5 Rom. 19:15 SPECIAL REDEMPTION While Universal Redemption is a great reality, it is such only as the basis of a particular application 1. The race is redeemed. It was virtually redeemed before it sinned and before it existed

Hence the instincts of all mankind and the traditions of history, pointing the unknown hope of nations.1 The mediatorial government of the world from the beginning has been a fruit and a proof of one great deliverance. No race unredeemed, and without hope of redemption, could in the universe of a holy God continue to propagate its generations The Holy Ghost was given at the outset as, in a peculiar sense, the Earnest of redemption, and Christ was from the very gate of Paradise the Lord of all, the Judge of the whole earth, the Savior of the world, the LIGHT OF MEN.2 1 Haggai 2:7; 2 John 1:4

2. But this universal salvation is bound up with one that is particular. (1.) The Scripture speaks only of one grand redemption; but it distinguishes, speaking of Him who is the Savior of all men, specially of those that believe.1 Here the special is other than the general redemption though springing from it; what makes it special is not the decree of sovereignty, but the faith of those who embrace it. The distinction, however, condemns those Latitudinarians who regard the whole race as, by the very fact of Christ's incarnation, individually redeemed, justified and saved. (2.) But it makes the two redemptions one in the sense that the individual benefit is only the application of a general benefit which belongs to all who do not reject it. The New Testament never really distinguishes between the redemption which is provided for all by price and that which is applied by power to all who embrace its provisions 1 1 Timothy 4:10

3. Hence, as there is no deliverance which is not individual, and no salvation which is not deliverance, the whole history of personal religion is exhibited in terms of Redemption: it is the release of the will, which is the universal benefit, the repentance which is bestowed by the Spirit of bondage, the release from the law of death in justification and regeneration, the redeeming from all iniquity in entire sanctification, the final expected redemption of the groaning creation, and the deliverance of the saints from the present evil world. Of each of these we shall treat in its place HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT The history of ecclesiastical doctrine on the Atonement is exceedingly complicated and difficult if all the various shades of opinion and controversy are taken into account; it is very simple if the fundamentals only are regarded

I. The Ante-Nicene age was neither scientific nor controversial on this subject. It was happily unconscious of those speculations which in later ages have done so much to darken the counsel of our redemption; although the germs of coming error are here and there discernible. Generally speaking, the early Patristic doctrine was an undistorted reflection of the teaching of the New Testament

1. The Apostolical Fathers, and the other writers of the second century, fairly reproduced the doctrine of St. Paul and St. John, the two pillars of the later Scriptural theology, who uniting in the necessity of propitiation in God Himself, then disparted: St. Paul exhibiting rather the judicial and rectoral view, St. John the love and moral influence of the Atonement. It will be found that both these aspects are with almost equal fidelity dwelt on; though the leading characteristic of that early teaching seems rather to have joined on to St. John's final presentation of Christ as in His incarnate Person the Living Atonement This is what might be expected, as the Apostolical Fathers were mostly under the influence of the last Evangelist. The sacrifice of Christ was kept constantly in view; and all the more as the early worship of the Church was based upon the Eucharistic commemoration of that Sacrifice. Even the exaggerations of the Holy Supper tended, until those exaggerations deepened into positive error, to keep the central character of the Saviour's death before the minds of Christians. It was after the days of these first writers that the perversions of the Feast diverted attention from the death to the Incarnation of our Lord. Clemens Romanus, the Father of uninspired Christian literature, strikes the true note on every point which later controversy has brought into prominence. A few phrases are sufficient to establish this: " Let us look steadfastly to the blood of Christ, and see how precious it is in God's sight (timion to Theo); which, being shed for our salvation, has brought the grace of repentance to all the world." " That by the blood of our Lord there should be redemption to all that believe and hope in God." "You see, beloved, what the pattern of love, patience, humility is which has been given us." "For the love that

He bore towards us, our Lord Jesus Christ gave His own blood for us by the will of God: His flesh for our flesh, His soul for our souls." These sentences give their high sanction, not only to the general doctrine of the Atonement laid down in the preceding pages, but also to some of the peculiarities which distinguish it. According to this earliest Father the atoning work of our Lord was a passion ordained by the Divine Will, endured by the Saviour's love, of infinite value as a satisfaction to Divine justice and mercy, available for all, the source of all the preliminary grace of repentance which is given to mankind at large, the substitutionary sacrifice for our souls, but yet of such a-kind that it avails for our bodies also, but made personal only by faith, and, finally, the supreme pattern of selfsacrificing devotion. It is needless to quote any further from the sub-Apostolic writers The Epistle to Diognetus is the work of an unknown author, probably of the second century, and may be referred to as giving the modern doctrine of the Atonement in its purest form. In it occur such sentences as these: "He Himself gave His own Son a Ransom for us, the Holy for transgressors, the Innocent for the guilty, the Righteous for the unrighteous, the Incorruptible for the corruptible, the Immortal for the mortal: for what could cover our sins but His righteousness? 0 sweet exchange—that the wickedness of many should be hid in One Righteous, and that the Righteousness of One should justify many." Here we have the Divinity of the Person of the Redeemer and His essential sinlessness lying at the very foundation of His work. The substitutionary character of His sufferings is all but expressed; and the redemption wrought for us, for all transgressors, is as prominent as the redemption wrought in us

2. The assaults of the Gnostics gave a peculiar direction to the teaching of the second and third centuries. They, differing much in detail, agreed that redemption was deliverance from matter through the work of the Savior; but that His sufferings were only symbolical, in the semblance of flesh teaching the necessity of death to the flesh. Irenaeus and Tertullian proclaimed the reality of the sufferings of the God-man, and their expiatory and substitutionary character, with a clearness and emphasis never since surpassed. The former has left this memorable sentence: " Quando incarnatus est et homo factus, longam hominum expositionem in se ipso recapitulavit in compendio nobis salutem praestans, ut quod perdideramus in Adamo, i.e., secundum imaginem et similitudinem esse Dei, hoc in Christo reciperemus." The same faithful reproduction of St. Paul's doctrine of the Two Adams is found in words which may be translated thus: " As we sinned in the first Adam, because we did not keep the commandments of God, so we have been reconciled or atoned for in the second Adam, because in Him we were obedient unto death, for to no other were we debtors than to Him Whose commandments we transgressed from the beginning." Tertullian is equally explicit. But it is in the writings of Justin Martyr that we have the fullest exhibition of the effects of the Atonement, though not without indistinctness on some points which may be ascribed to the peculiar difficulties of his apologetic work. He blends closely the two ideas of Sacrifice and Ransom. The endurance of the curse for us Justin rescues from the objection of the Jew, and in such a way as to show that the Son, blessed for ever and always blessed, suffered "FOR THE HUMAN RACE THE CURSES OF ALL." He is careful to show, what has been since too often forgotten, that " the sacrifice was for all sinners who are willing to repent, and fast Isaiah's fast." His doctrine of a vicarious atonement for the world is nonetheless strong because it requires personal faith, being " salvation for those that believe in Him." In Justin, as in all the Fathers before Augustine, we find the doctrine of a universal redemption made particular on the condition of individual repentance and faith

3. The early Fathers generally taught the necessity of a vindication of God's essential justice. Love was in God, as God was in Christ, passively bearing the punishment of the sinner as well as actively providing the atonement. But the assertion of God's righteousness before the universe was disturbed by some peculiar errors, the tendency to exaggerate the place of Satan being one of them, which more or less overshadowed the doctrine for a thousand years. Thess were partly a result of Gnosticism; but much more the effect of Origen's teaching. This Alexandrian Father, like Clement of the same school, elaborated the sacrificial scheme at all points, and taught explicitly the substitutionary character of the Passion. But his speculation almost neutralised his orthodoxy. Asserting the sole validity of the Redeemer's oblation, he assigned to the death of the martyrs a relatively expiatory virtue. Christ's sacrifice he declares to have been offered upon earth for man, in heaven for every spirit of the universe. Its redemption was a deliverance from Satan; but this in an unscriptural way. The human soul of Jesus was given to the Enemy as a ransom for the souls of men in his power; but he was unable to retain it and the world was free; the right he had over sinful men was lost when their sinless Representative was in his hands. Satan, as Gregory said afterwards, "hamo ejus incarnationis captus est," outwitted by the Divinity in the Redeemer on Which he had not calculated. Irenseus expressed the same thought: " The Logos, omnipotent and not wanting in essential justice, proceeded with strict justice even against the apostasy or kingdom of evil itself, redeeming from it that which was His own originally, not by using violence as did the devil in the beginning, but by persuasion, as it became God, so that neither justice should be infringed upon nor the creation of God perish." But a candid estimate of such a passage as this, which represents much of the teaching of that age, must admit that it contains only an inexact statement of the reconciliation of the essential claims of Divine justice, and the spiritual method of love by which men are to be redeemed. But here comes in another unhappy element. Origen taught that apostasy in a pretemporal state was expiated in the present, and finally through Christ abolished. It was impossible to hold such a view as this, without two concomitant errors: ascetic expiations would almost necessarily creep in when the flesh was made in any sense the sphere of bondage: and the justice of God, or His holy displeasure against evil, would soon be merged in the idea of a sovereign goodness predetermining the salvation of all. Hence redemption from the bondage of Satan was followed by the redemption of Satan himself. The universality of human redemption had never been doubted: but Origen made it include the whole universe of evil, reading an incorrect text: choris Theou, without or outside of God He tasted death for all.1 His Universalism was strenuously opposed by Jerome and others, and as held by Origen's followers was condemned formally at a Synod in Constantinople in A.D. 544

1 Hebrews 2:9

4. Apart from these errors, and germs of error, there can be no doubt that the ante-Nicene Church was profoundly and vitally familiar with the truth which we hold to be the sound one. They did not attempt to formulate it scientifically. Heresy on this subject could scarcely be said to exist; for the Gnostic errors were outside of the Christian Community, and were met by the simple statements of the Creed concerning the historical manifestation of the real Jesus. The earliest Fathers simply reproduced the spirit and language of the Apostles. And, when they seemed to err, their error was rather exegetical than theological. They did not propose to distinguish between a sacrifice offered to God, and a ransom laid down to Satan: but they failed to see clearly that the teaching of their inspired Masters made that sacrifice and that ransom one, and both as offered and paid by God to

Himself in Christ

II. From the Nicene Age down to Anselm, circ. A.D. 1100, the doctrine of redemption was closely bound up with that of the Person of Christ. But it had some independent developments to which brief reference may be made

1. Oriental Christendom was prepared for the study of the Atonement by its prolonged discussions of Trinitarian questions. Athanasius treats explicitly of the atonement for sin and satisfaction of eternal justice; gives supremacy to the priestly office; and, above all, bases the death of Christ on a necessity in the nature and attributes of God, though not perhaps so absolutely in the Divine nature as in the Divine veracity and dignity. Though he was the great expositor of the Incarnation as a disclosure of God in human nature, he placed first among the reasons for Christ's assumption of flesh the necessity of expiating human guilt. The following words give his teaching on almost every aspect of the question. " God cannot be untruthful, even for our benefit. Repentance does not satisfy the, demands of truth and justice. If the question pertained solely to the corruptions of sin, and not to the guilt and ill-desert of it, repentance might be sufficient. But since God is most truthful and just, who can save, in this emergency, but the Logos Who is above all created beings? He who created men from nothing could suffer for all, and be their substitute. Hence the Logos appeared. He Who was incorporeal, imperishable, omnipresent, manifested Himself. He saw both our misery and the threatening of the law; He saw how unbecoming (atopon) it would be for sin to escape the law, except through a fulfillment and satisfaction of it." Satan is omitted; satisfaction to the law is prominent; and, if an eternal necessity in God is not precisely laid down, the doctrine scarcely falls short of it. Gregory of Nazianzum (390) denies the ransom to Satan (theu tees ubreos); but dwells rather too strenuously on the exigency of the Divine government as the reason of the ransom paid to God. He gave the first note of the later Grotian theory: " Is it not plain that the Father received the ransom, not because He Himself required or needed it, but for the sake of the Divine government of the universe (di oikonomian), and because man must be sanctified through the incarnation of the Son of God." Cyril of Jerusalem (386) first made emphatic the THEANTHROPIC VALUE of the atoning death, and its universal vicarious-ness: this was a precious result of the Nestorian controversy. Cyril of Alexandria (444) still more clearly expounded this idea: " Only a God-man could suffer once for all and One for all:" again with reference to the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies. John of Damascus (759), the last of the Greek Fathers, expressed the general doctrine of his own time and some ages afterwards: " He who assumed death for us, died and offered Himself a sacrifice to the Father: for we had committed wrong against Him, and it was necessary that He should receive a ransom from us, and we thus be delivered from condemnation. God forbid that the blood of the Lord should be offered to Satan the tyrant." Here we find three watchwords of expiring orthodox Greek theology: The necessity of an atonement for wrong in the Divine righteousness the substitutionary character of the price, our ransom; and the connection of ransom both with sacrifice and with pardon

2. Western Christendom before the time of Anselm made no advance beyond the early Fathers, either in precision or in avoidance of error. It might have been supposed that one, Augustine, would have occupied his keen intellect with some of the questions which the New Testament had left undetermined and pre-ceding controversies had not settled. But he really added not a single idea. He inherited the old notion of a ransom paid to Satan's rights, corresponding with the sacrifice offered to God's justice. " God the Son, being clothed with humanity, subjugated even the

devil to man, extorting nothing from him by violence, but overcoming him by the law of justice; for it would have been injustice if the devil had not had the right to rule over the being whom he had taken captive." He disturbed the doctrine by making justification, or the imputation of righteousness to the believer, depend upon the infusion of grace, an error by which the whole work of redemption through an objective atonement for perfect expiation is clouded. Perhaps it would be more correct to say that he failed to reconcile the internal sanctification or righteousness wrought by the Spirit with the external sanctification or righteousness reckoned to him in whom the former is wrought. He erred from the Pauline phraseology perhaps more than from the Pauline doctrine. Moreover, he never expressed himself even with the same confidence as some of the Greeks as to the necessity of atonement to the justice of God: in other words, where they faltered he faltered still more. " They are foolish," he says, " who declare that the wisdom of God could not liberate men otherwise than by God assuming humanity, being born of a woman, and suffering at the hands of sinners." He separated omnipotence from justice, and taught, like Origen, that God's power was absolute in the provision for salvation. As the Arians thought that the Son was begotten, Bouleesei, by the will of the Father, so Augustine, with many before and after him, thought that the Atonement was not an eternal necessity but of the sole will of God

Finally, Augustine narrowed the range of the virtue of the Atonement: the first of the Fathers who did this. Gregory the Great (604), called the first Pontiff, is remarkably Pauline in this part of his teaching, and far beyond his predecessor Augustine. The following sentences give an idea of his theology. " Guilt can be extinguished only by a penal offering to justice." Christ " assumed our nature without our corruption. He made Himself a sacrifice for us: a victim able to die because of His humanity, and in Divine righteousness able to cleanse." During the next four hundred years there was no such special development of the doctrine as would warrant notice here

III. Anselm, in the latter part of the eleventh century, gave an entirely new direction to ecclesiastical thought on this great question: a direction which has been permanent

1. In his book CUR DEUS HOMO the idea of an atonement proper was exhibited as it had never before been seen; and the term Satisfaction to Divine justice became the leading formula. Anselm utterly rejected the claims of Satan to reparation; he fixed attention on the thought that sin is debt to God, a failure to give Him His due, and that, as " Suprema justitia non est aliud quam ipse Deus," satisfaction to the Divine justice was indispensable. As none but God could vindicate His own honor the God-man must atone; and His sacrifice as presenting FOR MAN " something greater than all that is not God" has infinite atoning value. The term SATISFACTION had been imported by Tertullian from jurisprudence into theology, but with reference especially to human acts of penitence; Hilary and Ambrose had referred it to the passion of Christ; but Anselm revived it from long slumber as a watchword for all future time. He does not distinguish between the active and the passive righteousness of the God-man in rendering this satisfaction; but he certainly lays the stress on the latter: dare animam seu tradere se ipsum morti ad honorem Dei, hoc ex debito Deus non exigit ab Illo. This sacrificial offering, of infinitely greater value than even the ethical demerit of sin, is the MERIT of Christ which overflows to everyone who believes. " Can anything be more just than for God to remit all debt, when in this way He receives a satisfaction greater than all the debt, provided only it be offered with the right sentiment?" Thus human Guilt or Debt demanded a Divine-human payment, and faith appropriates this as justification to the soul. There are flaws in the Anselmic doctrine: such as the subordinate episode that the number of redeemed

men would compensate the chasm introduced by the fall of angels. But nothing can dim the value of Anselm's service to Christian theology, as having established the immanent necessity in the Divine nature of an atonement for the infinite evil and offence of sin

2. Mediaeval controversy on this great question was very important as shaping in opposite directions the issues of Trent and the Reformation. The doctrine of Anselm was for four hundred years the common text: some opposed his Biblical theory, others refined upon and exaggerated his views, and a few struck out a path of mediation. This threefold distribution of Scholastic polemics will furnish a clue to the student who pursues this subject in ecclesiastical history

(1.) Abaelard (1141) was the chief opponent of Anselm; and may be said to be the founder of a theory of the Atonement which shuts out the deepest mystery of the Cross

He referred the Christian redemption only to the love of God as its source; and taught that there could be nothing in the Divine essence which absolutely required satisfaction for sin. Redemption like Creation was a Fiat: equally sure, equally free, and equally independent of anything in the creature. The influence of the work of Christ, as accomplished on the cross, and carried on in His intercession, is moral only: subduing the heart, awakening repentance, and leading the soul to the boundless mercy of God whose benevolence is the only attribute concerned in the pardon of sin. Peter Lombard (1164) varied from this view only little; and introduced, for future service, in his Liber Sententiarum, the perilous doctrine that Christ's penal sufferings deliver from the temporal consequences of evil. Duns Scotus denied the possibility of an infinite demerit in human transgression, and therefore the necessity of an infinite value in Christ's human suffering. The relation of the Atonement to sin was purely arbitrary, springing from the mere pleasure of God: " Every creaturely oblation is worth what God accepts it for, and nothing beyond." This is the theory of Acceptilatio, of which more hereafter

(2.) The Scholastic refinements on Anselm's doctrine Were endless. Bonaventura and Thomas Aquinas, who represent the later Schoolmen in their utmost subtlety, and more than any others shaped Romanist theology, distinguish between the absolute and relative necessity of atonement: holding the latter only, though admitting that of all possible modes this of satisfaction was most congruous with the Divine perfections. In their anxiety to save the freedom and omnipotence of God they introduced a distinction or discord into the Divine essence from which Anselm's theory is free. Aquinas laid great stress upon the Mystical Union between the Savior and His people; and here two errors crept in. Room was made for the limitation of redemption to the believer configured to his Lord: the guilt of the sinner being transferred to Christ even as Christ's merit is transferred to the sinner. This is in strange contradiction to the universality elsewhere assigned to the virtue of the Atonement. And, secondly, in the case of sin after baptism the believer must be " configured " to his Lord by personal penance. That penance is imperfect; but it is an expiation joined to the Redeemer's. Aquinas also introduced the distinction between the satisfaction and the merit of out Substitute. His theory that the satisfaction was offered to penal justice, and the merit of obedience wins eternal life for the Saint, was an anticipation of the subsequent distinction needlessly introduced between the Active and the Passive Righteousness of Christ. His new dogma of the superabundance of the Saviour's merits—Christi passio non solum sufficiens, sed etiam SUPER-ABUNDANS SATISFACTIO—which, while seeming to honor the Atonement, was certainly based upon a lowered estimate of sin, laid the foundation for the superstructure of a

treasury of merits at the disposal of the Church. The Thomists, as his followers were called, had a long controversy with the Scotists, followers of Duns Scotus, on this point and on many others that became afterwards prominent in the controversies of the Deformation

(3.) The Scholastics who mediated between Anselm's and the opposite doctrine were Bernard, Bonaventura, Alexander of Hales, and many of the later Mystics. They paved the way for the Reform of the Sixteenth Century: partly, by admitting a real laxity as to the ABSOLUTE necessity of atonement, which cannot be exchanged for a RELATIVE necessity without great peril; and, partly, by keeping alive in a narrower circle the Anselmic theory, which was to put forth its renewed energy in the great awakening. This was the case especially with some of the Mystics and Precursors of the Reformation, such as Wessel, who says: " Ipse Deus, ipse sacerdos, ipse hostia, pro se, de se, sibi satisfecit." These deep words deserve to be remembered for their own value, as well as because they were written on the threshold of the temple of reformed theology; as also those by which they are followed: "In Christ we behold not only a Reconciled but a Reconciling Deity; an incarnate God Who, in the sinner's place and for the sinner's salvation, furnishes what His own attributes of holiness and justice require."

IV. The Tridentine Soteriology, carefully studied, will be, found to depart widely from the Anselmic doctrine which it professes to hold: though this does not appear on the surface, and is not evident in the definitions. The following two opposite tendencies may be noted; referring, however, to the objective Atonement with which alone we have to do 1. The satisfaction rendered to Divine justice by the Passion of Christ is fully recognized

"Christus, qui, cum essemus inimici, propter nimiani caritatem, qua dilexit nos, nobis sua sanctissima passione ligno crucis justificationem meruit et pro nobis Deo Patri satisfecit." But it is added " abunde cumulateque satisfecit;" and hence the merit of Christ is in a sense over-estimated. The Thomist dogma of Meritum Christ! Super-abundans laid as we have seen the foundation of that treasury which, enlarged by the superfluous merit of the saints, and. committed to the Church, mystically one with and the same as Christ, constituted the source of Indulgences. Origen applied the infinite superfluity to the rest of the universe; this doctrine limited it to the remission of the temporal consequences of sin

2. On the other hand, the atoning merit is under-estimated: for the virtue of Christ's death is declared to avail only for the sins of the world, and those committed before baptism The virtue of the Atonement, as applied for mortal sins committed afterwards, must be connected, so far as the temporal or not eternal punishment is concerned, with man's own expiation

3. But it is rather in its subjective character, or in its individual aspect, as Justification, that the error of Roman Catholic theology appears. Reserving for the Righteousness of Faith some further remarks on this subject, we may be satisfied to refer to the Tridentine Canons which deny that the atoning satisfaction of Christ is the sole meritorious ground of a sinner's justification. Whatever value is attributed to the passion of the Redeemer as expiating the sin of mankind, righteousness is imputed to the personal sinner only as he is made righteous by the infusion of faith: it is, so to speak, imputed to the faith and not to the man who believes. Undoubtedly, it is affirmed that the grace which more and more justifies the soul comes through the Atonement. But the direct application of the Saviour's finished work in the purging of the conscience is effectually precluded

V. The Reformation revived generally the theory of Anselm, as that was the vindication of an eternal and absolute, and not merely a relative and economical, necessity for satisfaction in the Divine nature. The same variations in the statement of this which marked the Patristic and Scholastic theology are observable among the Reformers Luther, and the great divines that followed him, were more rigid than Calvin and his followers, who speak of the possibility of redemption even apart from the work of Christ

1. The points which the Lutheran theory and the Reformed Confession agreed in rescuing from the perversion of ages were the sufficiency of the Redeemer's Satisfaction for all sins, original and actual; the pre-eminence in the atoning work of the death of Christ, His incarnation and His resurrection flanking this on either side. The active side of the Saviour's obedience was added to the passive, a SATISPASSIO being divided off from the SATIS-FACTIO; or they regarded the whole virtue of the Atonement as Satisfaction and Merit, the former repairing the dishonor of the law and the latter providing righteousness for man. It may be said that both branches of the New Theology laid much stress on a division of the virtue of Christ's work into its reparation of the honor of the law by Obedience and its endurance of its penalty in the Passion

2. The Reformed or Calvinistic doctrine limited the scope and design of the Atonement to the elect; the Lutheran divines, after some hesitation, adopted the theory of a universal efficacy in the Redeemer's mediation. The Calvinists made less account of the three offices of the Redeemer: inasmuch as His work was rather the instrumental accomplishment of an eternal decree. Against the views of Piscator, who insisted that Christ's obedience to law was needed for Himself as man, and must be excluded from His vicarious atoning work, the Reformed Formula Consensus (1675) asserted: " Christ rendered satisfaction to God the Father, by the obedience of His death, in the place of the elect, in such sense that the entire obedience which He rendered to the law through the whole course of His life, whether actively or passively, ought to be reckoned into the account of His vicarious righteousness and obedience." This, like many other statements in the formularies and divines, is ambiguous: it only does not positively lay down the erroneous principle that the two parts of our Saviour's one obedience are distributed severally to the believer for release from condemnation and investiture with holiness. But the question here involved belongs rather to the doctrine of Justification

VI. The Socinian doctrine, if such it may be called, must be noticed here: partly because it represented in the seventeenth century the Rationalist assault on the principles of the Atonement which has been modified but not essentially changed in later times, and partly because it helped to shape the Anninian which followed it, and other systems of thought in other respects orthodox. Early Socinianism held a much higher estimate both of the Person and of the Work of Christ than that of the Modern Unitarians. But, as there could be in it no doctrine, strictly speaking, of the Incarnate Person, so it has no doctrine of Atonement. Its contribution to the history of the subject is simply the array of arguments against the Anselmic principles, and its method of explaining away Scripture, 1. The supreme principle in Socinianism as in Predestinarianism is an Absolute Sovereignty in God, disposing of all creatures according to His own will. In Calvinism the arbitrary will governs the destinies of men; in Socinianism it governs the attributes of God. It refuses to admit of any immutable qualities whether of justice or mercy in the Divine nature, these being only expressions of His occasional will, called out as it were by the conduct of man. An eternal justice demanding punishment is inconsistent with an eternal mercy prompting to forgive. Satisfaction for

sin is incompatible with love

Against this objection it is enough to say that it opposes the first principles of Scriptural teaching concerning God, Who is represented as reconciling in Himself these opposite attributes by an atonement which is at once and equally an expression of both, and regulating His will. Thus our doctrine is safe from Socinian censure only when it first shuts itself up in God, and grasps the reconciliation of justice and mercy in the Divine nature

2. Descending to the theory of Substitution, Socinianism denies its possibility in any form. Sin and punishment are both strictly and for ever personal. There is a form of the doctrine against which this plea has much force. But it does not touch our presentation of it. (1.) Strictly speaking, Christ is not a Substitute for any man. He is the Representative and Vicar of humanity, and the Other Self of the race, being the Second Adam; whilst He is the Other Self also of every believer who claims His sacrifice as his own, and says in the language of appropriating devotion, ALL THINE ARE MINE. But his sin is dealt with as his own and put away from him. He is CRUCIFIED WITH CHRIST.1 (2.) The objection that the Savior has not suffered the precise equivalent for man's sin is valid only against those who plead that there was such a commercial equivalent. He could not suffer eternal torments. The union of the Son of God with mankind gave His intention of atonement in suffering an infinite value: it was accepted as such because it was in His heart. In an infinitely higher sense than His servant Paul He said, I could wish! Eeuchómeen gár anáthema eínai autós egoó.2 (3.) In urging that the Redeemer's active obedience could not be vicarious as superadded to His passive obedience Socinianism is opposing a false dogma of the Atonement. (4.) Once more, the objection that imputation to faith is inconsistent with a plenary satisfaction is important. Socinus pleaded against the teaching which maintains that this universal benefit is given to none but those who believe. But that is not the true doctrine. Christ's benefit is imparted before personal faith; and, in case of believers, their faith is the not rejecting what was before provided for them as their own. The vehement protest against the combination of imputed active righteousness and the inexorable demand of the law has its full force against those whom it concerns; but not against those who believe that the appropriation of a full forgiveness sets the believer free to fulfill in love all the claims of righteousness 1 Galatians 2:20; 2 Romans 9:3

3. The more positive principles of Socinianism maintain that the sacrificial language used concerning the Redeemer only figuratively describes His authority in heaven to declare forgiveness; and that the Scriptures without figure announce pardon as waiting for all who, sympathizing with the Redeemer's death, repent and abandon their sins

(1.) According to the teaching of early Socinianism—as distinguished from that of modern Unitarianism—the Saviour's priestly office was only figurative on earth, and began in heaven where He uses His exalted authority to plead for mankind. " The sacerdotal office consists in this, that as He can in royal authority help us in all our necessities, so in His priestly character; and the character of His help is called by a figure His sacrifice." But it may be said that forgiveness is never represented as bestowed save through a real sacrifice: God is in Christ reconciling the world to Himself; and for Christ's sake forgives the sins which only the Spirit obtained by the Atonement enables us to confess and forsake

(2.) The Supreme in His majesty is said to forgive on the ground of repentance and obedience. The sufferings of Christ were the vehicle of a moral influence to induce that repentance and

animate and exemplify that obedience. There is no relaxation of the holy law, which is thus honored as the bond of obligation to the moral universe. We also hold the exemplary character of the sufferings of Christ; but as illustrating the necessity of a satisfaction to pure justice, and not merely the love and mercy of the Lawgiver. In modern times this argument has been reproduced in a thousand ways: these all marking the offence of the Cross which has not ceased. There are two everlasting safeguards of the truth: the constitution of the human mind which bears witness to the wrath as well as the love of God; and the express revelation of Scripture concerning the reconciliation

4. In recent times Socinian principles have been introduced into the Latitudinarian theology of many who do not reject the doctrine of the Trinity. And it is here that they are most dangerous. In the works of some divines, the love of God alone is introduced into the atoning sacrifice, which on Christ's part is a sublime and supreme act of repentance for man, His AMEN to the sentence of the law, and to man himself an affecting representative sorrow which he must make his own by adding to it the element of personal consciousness of guilt. The latter idea links it with the Romish doctrine of human additional expiation; and, as to the former, a representative sorrow that does not taste the wrath of God against sin falls immeasurably below the Scriptural illustrations of the atoning passion in which our Lord was made a curse for us. The theory utterly fails in the link between the Divine-human sorrow and the human appropriation of it; and it entirely forgets that Christ was made the embodiment and representative of sin as well as the incarnation of suffering. Other modifications of the Unitarian theory of the Atonement in combination with Trinitarian doctrine of God are endless; but none presents any such definitely marked system as needs arrest attention

VII. The doctrine of atonement which is sometimes characterised as Grotian and sometimes as Arminian is based on one common fundamental principle. Arminius and his follower Grotius held the same theory up to a certain point; after which they differ

1. Both aimed to mediate between the rigorous Anselmic view of a satisfaction which is the substitution of a strict equivalent for the penalty due to sin and the Socinian rejection of all vicarious intervention. The atoning reparation which they agree to uphold is one that satisfied not the rigor and exactitude of Divine justice only or especially but also and chiefly the just and compassionate will of God: laying the emphasis rather on the love than on the justice of God as honored in the Atonement. They refuse to regard the Saviour's redemption as the payment of a debt to a creditor; it is to them a substitute for a judicial penalty, which substitute being the oblation of Christ, infinitely precious, is counted sufficient by the Father. This has somewhat of the character of the Scotist ACCEPTILATIO (accepti latio), which was in Roman law an acquittance from obligation by word of mouth, without real payment; differing from it by assuming a real compensation, but not of an exact and commercial character. And here the Arminian principle comes in with a just protest. Grotius, who in his very important work on the Satisfaction of Christ reintroduced the term, was obliged to vindicate it. He insisted that his theory of a satisfaction offered by Christ, and reputed sufficient by God, was more than the Acceptilatio of Roman jurisprudence. In fact what God accounted sufficient was of infinite value; but still not the precise equivalent of the penalty due to sin. There was a relaxation of the claims of the law in one sense, though not in another. The most rigorous Anselmic theory must admit the principle, so far as the acceptance of a substitute goes; why not then carry the principle a little farther and make the

interfering act extend to the VALUE of the thing substituted as well as to the PRINCIPLE of substitution: especially as the value here is infinite? 2. But Grotius, its later representative, did not agree with the Arminian theology when he limited the satisfaction to the dignity of the law, the honor of the Lawgiver, the protection of the interests of the universe, and the exhibition of a deterrent example. Grotius founded what has been called the Rectoral or Governmental theory of the Atonement, which dwells too exclusively on its necessity for the vindication of God's righteousness as the Ruler of all. Not to speak of the invincible repugnance felt by every reverent mind to the thought that our Lord was thus made a spectacle to the universe, this theory errs by making a subordinate purpose supreme. Limborch, as the representative of Arminianism, answers his own question, An Christus morte sua circa Deum aliquid effecerit? by replying that the sufferings of Christ were those of a SACRIFICE Divinely appointed to take the place of a penalty, and reconciled God to man as if they had been the sinner's own punishment. Christ therefore by His death did effect something in God; though strictly speaking He only carried out in act what had been already effected in purpose

More than this the Scripture does not require. Arminianism holds that the Sacrifice was offered for the whole world: it must therefore for that reason also renounce the commutative theory of exact and mutual compensation; since some may perish for whom Christ died, and He would be defrauded of His reward in them VIII. A few brief observations may be made in conclusion

1. Most of the errors that have passed in review have sprung from failure to connect the three leading Biblical ideas: the atonement in God, as a necessity in the Divine attributes; the reconciliation on earth, as vindicating to the universe the Rectoral justice of God; and the exhibition of the redemption to man, as moving upon his conscience and will and heart. Here unite what are sometimes called the SUBSTITUTIONARY, the GOVERNMENTAL and the MORAL INFLUENCE theories. The union of these is the Scriptural doctrine, as it is set forth in Scripture; and especially in the Epistles of St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. John: the last giving in many particulars the finishing touches in the union of the Person and the Work of Christ. Neither of these theories is valid, standing alone. Each is necessary as the complement of the others. The doctrine would commend itself more than it does to the minds of all devout persons if justice was done to every aspect. The champion of either of these theories who thinks it necessary absolutely to deny the truth of the others proves that his own is wrong

2. Another prevalent source of confusion is the tendency to undervalue the personality and comparative independence of man's relation to God. No doctrine of revealed religion stamps such dignity on the human spirit as that which makes it the object of this stupendous intervention. But there is a certain Pantheism which infects much of the theology of the modern Christian Church, tinging the theories and vocabulary even when the ground principles of Pantheism are rejected or perhaps not understood. The more closely the speculations of this philosophical Christianity are studied the more manifest will it be that they reduce the Person and Work of Christ to the rank of mere symbols of transcendental mysteries of evolution, which seem to do honor to the union of God and man but at the expense of everything that may be called Mediation. The individuality of the soul is lost, and man is merged in humanity. But it is not in England that we have to encounter this substitute for the doctrine of the Atonement

3. Akin to this, though distinct from it, is the tendency, not especially modern, to underestimate the evil of sin. Theories of the Atonement fluctuate with theories of the evil that makes it necessary. If sin is regarded as a necessary phenomenon of human development, the Atonement must needs only be an accidental aid in that development. If it is viewed as only a disease or only as misery, then the atonement will be regarded as only an expedient, though one of the highest and most effectual, for the remedy of human weakness. But if sin is regarded, in the light of Scripture, as an active rebellion of the human will which affects the Divine nature and attributes and government as well as human interests, then the Atonement becomes an eternal necessity in God as well as an eternal necessity for man. Every theory that robs the work of Christ of its expiatory character will be found, on close examination, to make sin comparatively A LIGHT THING as touching the Supreme Ruler, however melancholy in its workings and consequences to its victim. Now there is nothing more plain than that the Bible, from the history of the loss of Paradise to the prediction of Paradise re-entered, consistently and uniformly teaches that wrong in the creature touches the inmost essence of the Triune God; and that it evolves in the depths of the Divine nature eternal pity for the evil and eternal displeasure towards the sin. No single topic in Biblical theology is so little varied in its development as this

4. There is prevalent among professedly orthodox theologians a tendency to ascribe to the Eternal God a certain all-commanding attribute of LOVE which is so described as to undermine the foundations of the doctrine of the Atonement. It is possible so to exaggerate the Divine compassion as to make it inconsistent with the most obvious facts of experience. The mind may be so possessed by a morbid sentiment of the necessary supremacy of the tenderness of God as to be incapable of steadily contemplating His holy wrath against sin. To such a feeling the whole of Scripture must appear to be written in a language of the most violent and incongruous symbols. It is the purest homage to love, the bond of perfectness in God as well as man, to correct that one-sided view. If it is the royal attribute—which, however, the Scripture does not say—it reigns IN God but not OVER Him. Of the Divine Being it is also said: Justice and judgment are the habitation of Thy throne.1

1 Psalms 89:14

5. It is important to remember in all discussions on the Atonement that the language of theology must be controlled and explained by the language of Scripture. Through forgetting this many prejudices arise which would otherwise perhaps be obviated. The leading New-Testament terms are so simple that they may be comprised in one sentence

Christ as MEDIATOR exhibits in His own Person the RECONCILIATION between God and mankind, which however required to be wrought out by a SACRIFICE of OBEDIENCE in life and death, such as has PROPITIATED God in respect to sin, and accomplished a REDEMPTION for all men, to be appropriated by the faith of individuals. Theology has varied these terms and added a few. They indicate that the oblation of Christ was an ATONEMENT or atoning SATISFACTION of the Divine justice and the claims of law, as well as of the Divine love or saving will, EXPIATING the sin or canceling its punishment, and PROPITIATING the Divine displeasure, in one and the same act. As the Scriptures are a revelation of God to man, so this doctrine, which lies at the base of that revelation, pervading it from beginning to end, must be guarded with the most watchful diligence

Only at the Cross, where the Father accepts for us the sacrifice of His Son. our Representative, is the true God revealed to mankind

24. Vol 02 - The Administration of Redemption

The Administration of Redemption THE ADMINISTRATION OF REDEMPTION.

TERMS DEFINED THIS sentence better than any other defines that comprehensive department of theological science which is occupied with the subjective aspect of what is sometimes called SOTERIOLOGY. If we use the phrase APPLICATION OF REDEMPTION we are in danger of the Predestinarian error which assumes that the finished work of Christ is applied to the individual according to the fixed purpose of an election of grace. The phrase APPROPRIATION OF SALVATION tends to the other and Pelagian extreme, too obviously making the atoning provision of Christ matter of individual free acceptance or rejection The term PERSONAL SALVATION avoids these extremes; but it scarcely does honor enough to the office of the Holy Ghost. The ADMINISTRATION OF REDEMPTION satisfies every necessary condition. This is the widest field of theology: gathering up the results of all that precede and more or less anticipating the one only branch that remains A complete view of this entire department of Christian Theology may be thus taken in order. First, we must define the special relations of God the Spirit to the administration of the Saviour’s work. Then we have to consider the character, terms and conditions of the universal Call of the Gospel: the agency of the Holy Ghost in the outer court of the temple of redemption. Thirdly, it will be necessary to dwell on the preliminary conditions of grace, or those subjects that belong to Conversion, Repentance and Faith: which form the transition, fourthly, to the state of covenanted salvation itself, with all its many privileges diversified in their unity. Fifthly, it will then be of great importance to examine the general conditions on which the perpetuity of these blessings depends. This will fairly introduce the Morals of the Gospel, in the establishment of a holy character, as formed by Christianity, which ought not to be severed from the Spirit’s administration. And, lastly, the Church must be included, whether as the fellowship resulting from the bestowment of grace, or as the institute in and through which that grace is bestowed The distinction between Objective and Subjective Soteriology, or Redemption as once for all accomplished by Christ and Redemption as administered by the Holy Spirit, has been again and again referred to. But its importance is so great that it may once more be impressed with advantage at this point. A careful consideration of the bearings of this distinction would itself be a defense, and a sufficient defense, against many of the most serious errors that have troubled and still trouble the faith of Christianity. We shall find illustrations of this in abundance. It is sufficient now to assert and vindicate the distinction itself, as it reigns throughout the New Testament. The offices of the Second and of the Third Persons of the Holy Trinity in the work of man’s salvation are not more carefully separated than the one redemption wrought out by the Former is separated from the personal application of it, which is the province of the Latter. The term Soteriology fairly embraces both; but it has not been naturalized in English theological works, and it is not without a certain ambiguity

25. Vol 02 - The Holy Spirit

The Holy Spirit THE HOLY SPIRIT: IN PREPARATION OF REDEMPTION

Before Christ in Christ in the Gospels

AFTER PENTECOST Economy of Spirit Agent of Christ Two Classes of Office in the Church Divine in His Subordination Scriptural Formulas As the Incarnate Son is the Redeemer of Mankind in virtue of His perfect work of Reconciliation, so the Holy Ghost in His Divine personality is the Administrator of that redemption. His revelation as such has kept pace with the revelation of the redeeming Son. In the Old-Testament age He was the promise of the Father, even as the Christ was: and, as the promised Christ already was the world's unrevealed Savior, so the Spirit was the unrevealed Dispenser of His salvation. The Redeemer made the promise of the Father His own promise; and, on His ascension, obtained and sent, as the fruit of His mediatorial obedience, the Holy Ghost in His most abundant influence as the Third Person of the Godhead and the Personal Agent in the final accomplishment of the purpose of the Mediatorial Trinity THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE PREPARATIONS OF REDEMPTION The distinct personality of the Holy Ghost is not made prominent in Scripture until the act of atonement is on the eve of completion. But the light of the later Scriptures thrown back upon the earlier reveals Him as a Divine Person present and active throughout the preparatory economy. With the coming of Christ His agency becomes more distinct; and it is from that time forward intimately connected with our Lord's redeeming Person and work. The full disclosure, however, of the Person and Offices of the Spirit, and of His relation to the finished redemption of the world, was not given until the set time for the Pentecostal revelation of the Third Person was fully come; that is, until the Redeemer had ended His work upon earth and ascended to heaven THE SPIRIT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT The Holy Ghost in His special relation to the Christian economy was not sent down until Pentecost. But, as the Person in the Holy Trinity by Whom the Father's Revelation of Himself through the Son, whether in Creation or Providence or Redemption, is accomplished in act, He has been present and operative from the beginning: the Administrator of the work of the Three-One God in every dispensation

1. The Spirit, like the Son, but without concealment of His name, is throughout the Old Testament disclosed as the Agent of the Godhead in the production of all life, especially of the living spirit of man. In anticipation, as it were, of Pentecost, He was at the beginning THE LORD AND GIVER OF LIFE; and Job's word may be used in the widest extent concerning man as such: the Spirit of God hath made me.1 The Son from the beginning has been the Life of men; but it was not till the Incarnation that He gave that life more abundantly, and was fully revealed as THE LIFE.2 This distinction also holds good between the unrevealed and the revealed relation of the Personal Medium of the gift of life. The same Spirit Who moved upon the face of the waters3 was breathed into the face of man and made him a living soul.4 And, as the Son was from the beginning the Light of men,5 so the Spirit is represented as moving upon and striving with man from the beginning.6 The unrevealed Second Person gave special and mysterious manifestations of Himself as the Angel of Jehovah, the Word of the Lord, and so the unrevealed Third Person is

often referred to as the Divine Agent in spiritual gifts and influences. Thus of Bezaleel it is said: I have filled him with the Spirit of God.7 And of Moses,8 Joshua 9:1-27 and the Judges 10:1-18 and the first kings, it is recorded that the Spirit endowed them for their office. Thus, carrying back the personality of the Holy Ghost from the New Testament to the Old, we are taught that without Him the Eternal did not act on the world throughout the ancient economy

1 Job 33:4; 2 John 1:4; 3 Genesis 1:2; 4 Genesis 2:7; 5 John 1:4; 6 Genesis 6:3; 7 Exodus 31:3; 8 Numbers 11:17; 9 Numbers 27:18; 10 Judges 3:10

2. But specifically in the administration of the prophetic preparations of the Gospel is this truth seen.1 The doctrine of the Saviour's Person and Work has made it plain that the revelation of the Son was mediated by the Spirit of Christ which was in the prophets; that the entire Old Testament as the record of the Gospel before the Advent was given by His inspiration; and that He, no less than the Son Himself, was the Promise of the Father.2 1 1 Samuel 16:13-14; 2 Acts 1:4 THE SPIRIT IN THE GOSPELS The Holy Spirit in the history of the Lord's manifestation and life upon earth occupies a midway position between the Old Testament and the Pentecost. As the Administrator of Redemption He appears as the actual Agent in the raising up and the mission of the Incarnate Savior; while He is at the same time the Object of our Lord's prophecy as His future Agent in carrying out His work. Every reference to the Holy Ghost in the Gospels falls under one or other of these heads

1. With regard to the former, it is enough to recapitulate what has already been established: first, that the human nature of the Son was the special Divine production of the Holy Ghost; and, secondly, that whatever in the Incarnate Person and Work of Jesus belongs to Him as the representative of mankind is under the Spirit's direction; while all that belongs to Him as the representative of Deity is the act of His own Eternal Spirit as the Son. The Third Person presides especially over the humble and subordinate relation of the Mediatorial Second Person in the economy of redemption

2. With regard to the latter, the records of the Evangelists furnish a series of testimonies of the Savior Himself concerning the future dispensation of the Spirit which culminate in the farewell discourses and the resurrection promise

(1.) How much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him!1 begins the series with a free and unlimited declaration which should throw its grace over all that follows throughout this department of theology. It is to the administration of redemption what the Protevangelium is to redemption itself: it is the dawn of the Pentecostal day

1 Luke 11:13

(2.) This spake He of the Spirit, which they that believe on Him should receive: for the [Holy] Spirit was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.1 In this saying, the link between the former and the final promises, St. John, as his manner is on special occasions, expounds his Master's word, writing long after Pentecost: it teaches us that the Person and gifts of the Spirit were reserved until the Saviour's glorification and the full manifestation of both dependent upon it. Jesus must be glorified of the Father before the Spirit glorified Him

1 John 7:39

(3.) Passing over the specific promises of the Spirit to the Apostles, as contained in the Synoptists, we have our Lord's most full foreannouncement of the coming and function of His Divine Representative. The farewell discourse is in truth a revelation of the Trinity; our Lord, setting out with a declaration of His own identity with the Father in the Divine nature, proceeds to declare that the Spirit should come as a Person, to abide for ever1 with His people, as the Revealer of all His truth and the indwelling Guide of all believers. Before He fulfilled His course on earth, like the Baptist He announced the coming of another: but did not add, like His own forerunner, He must increase, but I must decrease.2 The Holy Spirit, though Himself God, should, in the present economy, only glorify the Son, by revealing His Person and expanding His doctrine and administering His kingdom. We are the witnesses of Him; and so is also the Holy Ghost.3 1 John 14:16; 2 John 3:30; 3 Acts 5:32 THE HOLY SPIRIT AFTER PENTECOST With Pentecost begins the dispensation of the Spirit. His office has supreme reference to the administration of Christ and His redemption. And this is under three aspects. He is the Revealer of the Son generally, and of the Godhead as revealed in Him. He is the Saviour's Agent in dispensing individual salvation: being a witness for Him TO the soul; His Divine power IN the soul; but both in one. He is the Lord's representative in His body the Church: gathering it from the world, ruling within it, and dispensing the gifts of its Head. But, while subordinate in the mediatorial economy, the Holy Ghost is a Divine Person, the Agent, in the unity of the Father and the Son, of His own Divine acts This assemblage of topics must be exhibited only in epitome. To a great extent they have been anticipated in the discussion of the Trinity and the Person and Offices of Christ

They arise also in separate discussion throughout the whole course of this part of our subject: the work and influences of the Spirit meet us everywhere, being so ubiquitous that it is almost impossible to reduce all to summary. But the honor due to the everblessed Spirit of the Father and the Son, and the just demands of dogmatic system, alike require that some general analysis of the agency of the Holy Ghost be placed here in the forefront. A third reason also may be assigned, arising out of the indistinctness which has prevailed on this subject in much of the theology of earlier and later times. As to the earlier development of the doctrine enough has been already said when treating of the Trinity. As to later ages, it cannot be said that there has been any development: there has been no such controversy, and no such decisions have been formulated, as we have to do with in the Person of Christ. The offices of the Holy Ghost have been obscured by exaggerations of sacramental efficacy; and His personal relations to the believer have been undervalued in many systems. But what requires to be noted on these points will occur under the several heads of His general administrations. No separate historical review will be needed ECONOMY OF THE SPIRIT

1. The New Testament does not sanction the thought that with Pentecost began a dispensation of the Spirit in the sense of a new economy or oikonomia, distinct from that of the Father and the Son. The nearest approach to such a doctrine is found in St. Paul's Corinthian exhibition of the contrast between the old and new forms of the one covenant in Christ. The former was a ministration,1 or diakonia, of the letter, and of condemnation, and of death: a glorious manifestation of the Divine law which shut up the covenant people to the need and the expectation of an atoning Savior. The latter is a ministration of the Spirit, and of life, and of righteousness: a much more glorious manifestation of the Redeeming Lord, and of His Spirit, and of liberty in Him. Now this ministration, of which the Apostles were the ministers, is in the sequel called the Ministry

of Reconciliation.2 Thus the dispensation of the finished Atonement and the dispensation of the Spirit are one 1 2 Corinthians 3:6-11; 2 2 Corinthians 5:18

2. But there is a sense in which Pentecost introduced a new economy: that of the Holy Ghost, as the final revelation of the Holy Trinity. The One God, known in the Old Testament as Jehovah, a Name common to the Three Persons, was then made known in the Third Person: ho de Kurios to Pneuma estin, the Lord the Son reveals the Father as the Lord the Spirit.1 Hence the glory of the day of Pentecost, excelling in glory every former manifestation of the Supreme. The Shekinah, the ancient symbol of the future incarnation of the Son tabernacling in flesh, becomes the fire of the Holy Ghost, disparted into tongues, and, without a veil, resting on the entire Church.2 The perfect God is perfectly revealed; but revealed in the Trinity of Redemption, the Economical Trinity The Church is the habitation of God through the Spirit.3 From that day forward the Holy Ghost is essential to every exhibition of God as revealed among men. While it still remains true that the Son hath declared4 the Father, it is also true that the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God,5 of both the Father and the Son, and is the foremost and first Agent in the communion between God and His people. As neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him,6 so no man can say the words Jesus is Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.7

1 2 Corinthians 3:17; 2 Acts 2:3; 3 Ephesians 2:22; 4 John 1:18; 5 1 Corinthians 2:10; 6 Matthew 11:27; 7 1 Corinthians 12:3 REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SAVIOUR

We do not find in the New Testament any term which directly sanctions the phrases current in theology concerning the Holy Spirit’s office as the Redeemer’s Representative The Lord does not speak of Him as His Successor, or Deputy, or Agent, or Administrator

But, though these words are not used, what they signify is plainly to be gathered from the tenor of the final discourses in St. John. These enlarge upon the vicarious relation of the Spirit generally; and that particularly in regard to both the Person and the Work of Christ

I. The Saviour’s departure was expedient in order to His coming. He was Another Comforter;1 and to be sent in the Redeemer’s Name: The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, Whom the Father will send in My name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.2 He is therefore the Representative of Christ Himself, in His prophetic office as the Teacher and the Truth; hence He is the Spirit of the Truth.3 He is the Interpreter of the mystery of the Person of Jesus: He shall glorify Me;4 and no man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost.5 Moreover, the promise of the Comforter is the promise of our Lord’s ever-present Self; I will not leave you comfortless; I will come to you.6 The Spirit’s teaching was to be still no other than the teaching of Jesus: recalled to remembrance, expounded and enlarged. As the Son spoke what He heard of the Father, so the Holy Ghost should speak what He hears of the Son: He shall not speak of Himself: but whatsoever He shall hear that shall He speak: ... He shall receive of Mine and shall show it unto you.7 The doctrine of the mediatorial Trinity, one in essence and distinct in office, affords the explanation: All things that the Father hath are Mine: therefore said I, that He shall take of Mine, and shall show it unto you.8 The Spirit of Christ in the Prophets is the Spirit of Christ in the Apostles. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches9 follows the injunction to write which the Evangelist received from Jesus: a singular instance of the identity in difference and difference in identity between the

Lord and the Holy Ghost. He is also the Spirit of Christ in all true Christians: ye have an unction from the Holy One and ye know all things.10 He is the only Vicar of Christ

1 John 14:16; 2 John 14:26; 3 John 14:17 : 4 John 16:14; 5 1 Corinthians 12:3; 6 John 14:18; 7 John 16:13-14; 8 John 16:15; 9 Revelation 2:17; 10 1 John 2:20

II. The Person and the Work of Jesus are one. The Spirit is the Representative of the Redeemer generally, and in His several offices; in His relation to the world, and in His special relation to His people, Through Him alone He acts as the Savior

1. When our Lord cried It is finished,1 He declared that His work of atonement was accomplished. But it was accomplished only as a provision for the salvation of men. The application of the benefit remained for the administration of the Spirit from heaven; Whose sole and supreme office it is to carry into effect every design of the redemptive undertaking. As the Spirit of the Christ2 had from the foundation of the world administered the evangelical preparations, so now He acts on behalf of the fully revealed Christ. Through Him our Lord continues His prophetic office: the Holy Ghost is the Inspirer of the new Scriptures and the Supreme Teacher in the new economy. Through Him the priestly office is in another sense perpetuated: the ministry of reconciliation is a ministration of the Spirit.3 And through Him the Lord administers His regal authority 1 John 19:30; 2 1 Peter 1:11 3 2 Corinthians 3:8

2. The Spirit represents Christ to the world. While the Incarnate Lord was not yet glorified He was limited to one sphere: and, though the world was in His heart, His feet ran not so fast as His desire. But now the Spirit presents Jesus and exhibits His claims to all men. And when He is come He will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment.1 The sin of which He convicts the world has its formal character in the rejection of Christ; the righteousness of which He convinces the world is the finished righteousness of the absent Lord as the only ground and the only source of human acceptance before the law; and the judgment with which He threatens it is the separation between all that belong to the Prince of this world and those who belong to Jesus its true Lord. Thus the whole work of the Convincer is the ascended Redeemer still pleading His own cause

1 John 16:8-11

3. He is the representative of Christ to His people. To them He is the Paraclete: ho Parakleetos, the Advocate,1 Helper, and all-sufficient Comforter in the name of Jesus, our other Parakleetos in heaven. Through His agency our Lord is with us alway, even unto the end of the world.2 As He said He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father,3 so we may add that all who receive His Spirit receive Him: I and My Spirit ARE ONE.4 The day will come that He will cease to be the Representative of an absent Lord. Till then, the presence of the invisible Spirit is the real presence of the Redeemer in His Church. What His various functions are as Christ AMONG us and Christ WITHIN us will be more fully unfolded as we proceed 1 1 John 2:1; 2 Matthew 28:20; 3 John 14:9; 4 John 10:30 THE AGENT IN PERSONAL SALVATION As the Intermediary between the Savior and the individual soul the Spirit has two classes of office: one more external and one more internal. And these functions He discharges in respect to two orders of men: those not yet in Christ and those who are by faith united to Him

1. His external function is that of bearing witness, or applying the truth to the mind: to the unconverted for the conviction of sin, the awakening of desire for Jesus and His salvation, and the revelation to penitence of the promises of grace; to the believer for the assurance of acceptance, the unfolding of the knowledge of Christ, the application of the several promises of grace, and all that belongs to His personal instruction and guidance through the Word. These administrations will reappear in detail

2. His internal function is the exercise of Divine power on the heart, or within the soul: to the unconverted in infusing the grace of penitence and the power of faith, issuing in an effectual inward conversion; to the believer in renewing the soul by communicating a new spiritual life, and carrying on the entire work of sanctification to its utmost issues, as we shall hereafter see

3. This distinction rules the phraseology of the New Testament: a large class of passages refer to the Holy Spirit's communications TO the spirit, and an equally large class to His operations WITHIN it. In the former He is rather the administrator of the words of the New Covenant spoken to man, in the latter the administrator of the grace of that covenant within his soul. But it is obvious that the two are really one, especially in the case of the believer. As to those who are without, the Spirit's appeals may fail to enter the heart so as to be permanent. But when true faith effects the union with Christ the Comforter is an indwelling Spirit: the Paraclete, or external Advocate, becomes an intercessory Presence within. The Scriptural references to the distinction and the unity may be reserved for the future detail of the Spirit's administration IN THE CHURCH The Spirit's administration is closely connected with the institution of the Christian Church. This also must have its appropriate place in the sequel. Meanwhile it is necessary and sufficient to indicate its bearing on the offices of the Holy Ghost generally

1. The order of this connection must be noted. It is not first the Church, and then the Spirit; but, conversely, the Spirit forms the Church as the sphere and organ of His working: a distinction which, as will be seen, is of great importance. There is a sense in which the Redeemer prepared the body for the Spirit's inhabitation; even as the Spirit prepared His body for the inhabitation of the Son of God. The Day of Pentecost found the disciples waiting for the Third Manifestation of the Trinity. From that time the Church is the body of Christ which His Representative animates. But in its increase that Body is gathered out of the world by the Holy Ghost, whose general office is Vocation, which calls men into the congregation of the Called, the ekklesia or Church. UBI SPIRITUS IBI ECCLESIA

2. In that body He is supreme, as the Representative of the Holy Trinity and of Christ its Head. From the time when the interval of interregnum ended, and the little company, who had waited ten days without the Lord and without His Successor, were filled with the Holy Ghost, He has been in the Christian fellowship what Christ was in the midst of His disciples. He gave to its keeping the New Scriptures written under His inspiration. He calls, and consecrates, and orders its various ministry. He regulates and animates all worship. He dispenses His various gifts to all classes according to His own will. He is not the Head of the Church, but the Representative of its Head

3. That body is the instrument of His agency in general. It is true that He is not limited to this one organ. Wherever His word is He is, and that word is never without His influence

And, even beyond the written word, and beyond the visible community, He is a Divine Presence everywhere. But it is in the congregation of Christ, in the Church of God, that He has set up the means of grace efficacious in His hands for the conversion of sinners, for the sealing and sanctifying of the saints, and for the spread of the kingdom of heaven upon earth. As the Spirit Who applies the work of Christ His field is the world, but His agents are His called and chosen and faithful people. This view of His indwelling and agency runs through the New Testament from Pentecost, the day of the Holy Ghost, down to the last reference in Scripture, when the Spirit and the Bride say, Come,1 uniting as one voice in invoking the Savior. And it is this which warrants our including the Christian Church under the department of the Administration of Redemption 1 Revelation 22:17 THE SPIRIT A DIVINE AGENT

What has been again and again directly or indirectly asserted must be made emphatic in conclusion: that the Holy Ghost, in the unity of the Father and the Son, is a personal, Divine agent in all His offices. In the economical Trinity subordinate, and administering the covenant of redemption which originated in God as the Father and was ratified by God as the Son, He is nevertheless Himself the Fullness of God. As Christ is that fullness BODILY,1 so the Holy Ghost is that fullness SPIRITUALLY. This must be remembered in the interpretation of many passages in which there are seemingly opposite statements 1 Colossians 2:9

I. There is a class of texts which assign to the Third Person a peculiar relation to each of the other Persons of the Trinity: these must always be connected with passages which contain predicates of His Divine Person as Subject, so to speak, independent of those other Persons. Under the doctrine of the Godhead the Personality and Deity of the Holy Ghost has been discussed: it is introduced here only in reference to His Mediatorial relation to the Christian economy. Though we believe, with the ancient Church, that there was, or rather is, an eternal procession from the Eternal Father, the Head of the Holy Trinity, and from the Eternal Son, the Only-begotten God, we have most to do, in the present section, with the Temporal Mission corresponding on earth to the Eternal Procession in heaven

1. The Holy Ghost is the Spirit of the First Person, proceeding from the Father1 and given through the mediation of Jesus; the Spirit of HisSong of Solomon 2:1-17 sent forth to those who through Him are sons; the Spirit of God generally; and the Spirit of the Christ.3 Now it may be said by the opponent that such passages simply mean the mode of the Divine operation thus described, and sometimes even personified: just as, in human relations, we might speak of the spirit of any eminent teacher. The most violent instance of such personification is said to be the reference to the Spirit of the Truth4 as a personal agent 1 John 15:26; 2 Galatians 4:6; 3 1 Peter 1:11; 4 John 16:13

2. But with these must be connected other passages in which He is named the Spirit or the Holy Spirit, absolutely, and in such a way as to distinguish Him both from the Father and from the Son; and some of them in such connections as to imply His essential and not merely relative or subordinate Deity. Where the Savior predicts His own departure He speaks of its necessity in order to the coming of Another Comforter;1 and a careful study of the context of the final discourses will show that He could not mean a personified influence. The same may be said of the sin against the Holy Ghost, which proves both His personality and His essential Deity; and, though those first hypocrites in the Acts might not commit that sin, they agreed together to tempt the Spirit

of the Lord, to lie to the Holy Ghost,2 and lied not unto men, but unto God. That passages so seldom occur in which the Third Person is mentioned as God is to be explained on the same principle which explains the infrequent assertion of the supreme Divinity of the Son: the Holy Ghost may be reverently said to share the exinanition and subordination of the Second Person of the Mediatorial Trinity. But, in the intercommunion, interaction, or perichoreesis of the Trinity, He is interchangeably God, the Spirit of God, the Spirit of the Father, the Spirit of the Son, or the Holy Spirit absolutely 1 John 14:16; 2 Acts 5:3-9

II. There is a large class of texts which refer to the Holy Ghost as a gift and an influence sent down through the mediation of Christ and as its most comprehensive result

1. The great majority of the testimonies of Scripture are of this order. The Old-Testament predictions, whether of symbol or of promise, speak of the future gift as the searching effect of fire, as water poured out, as a rushing wind, and, in special relation to the Christ, as an oil of unction. These four symbols were merged into the great Personal Gift of the Pentecost; but they govern the language of the entire New-Testament, from the baptizing with the Holy Ghost and with fire1 of the Baptist's promise down to the renewing of the Holy Ghost which He shed on us abundantly.2 The symbols and their meaning must be more fully considered hereafter in relation to the blessings they symbolize: it may suffice now to indicate the fact that the Spirit is constantly spoken of as a gift poured out upon the world and into the hearts of believers 1 Matthew 3:11; 2 Titus 3:5-6

2. But two things must be remembered here: over and above the general principle, so often referred to, of a mediatorial subordination of Two Persons in the Holy Trinity

(1.) The phraseology used in the New Testament seems to distinguish between the Person and the Gift. The distinction is not constant, but it is nearly so, between tó Pneúma, the Spirit the Holy One, and to agion, Holy Spirit: a distinction which cannot be pressed into dogmatic service, because it is matter of contention among grammatical exegetes, but is nevertheless so marked in the New Testament as to be very suggestive. The former is used by our Lord in His great foreannouncement, as an august appellative standing alone and with the now first-uttered appendage of personality, ekeinos: The Comforter, which is THE SPIRIT THE HOLY . . . He shall teach.1 Afterwards He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the HOLY GHOST2, pneuma agion. The same distinction is literally found at those two minor Pentecosts when first the Gentiles and then the relicts of John the Baptist's ministry received the Great Gift. In the narrative of the former The Spirit the Holy fell on them as on us at the beginning,3 according to the promise Ye shall be baptized with Holy Spirit. In that of the latter, St. Paul asked if on believing they had received Holy Spirit: and, on the laying on of his hands, The Spirit the Holy came on them.4 Nor is the Pentecost proper without its evidence. In the days of preparation for it St. Peter speaks of The Spirit the Holy5 Who spake by the mouth of David; on the day itself they were all filled with Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance.6 Here the personal Spirit as the Giver has the Article and as the gift is without it. The last verse quoted introduces the usage of dropping the to agion, the Holy. Without this adjective the Spirit standing alone constantly occurs, where personal acts are in question. So in the Apocalypse, what the Spirit saith unto the churches.7 Here it is to Pneuma, but, immediately afterwards, I was in the. Spirit, en pneumati, without the article. Where the personal Spirit in the Trinity is symbolically referred to, as the one sevenfold or perfect Spirit, the phrase is, with the article, ta epat pneumata ton Theou, the

Seven Spirits of God: the symbolical Fire of the Day of Pentecost returns as seven lamps of fire burning before the throne. Pondering this distinction as running through the New Testament we shall—without attributing to it undue importance—find it a preservative against falling into the error of reducing the Holy Ghost to a personified gift. And, the more we ponder it, the more clearly shall we see that there is a strict and impressive and instructive analogy between the variations clustering around the term Son and those which cluster around the term Spirit. As the One is given and sent, so also is the Other the same law interprets both

1 John 14:26; 2 John 20:22; 3 Acts 11:15-16; 4 Acts 19:2-6; 5 Acts 1:16; 6 Acts 2:4; 7 Revelation 3:22; Revelation 4:2-5

(2.) The gifts of the Spirit are not always said to be poured out by the Father on the Son, and through Him on the Church: sometimes they are the dispensations of the Holy Ghost Himself. As the Son is both Priest and Sacrifice, so the Spirit is both Gift and Giver. One classical passage is sufficient to illustrate this. Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit . . .. The manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal . . . But all these worketh that One and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as He will.1 The Holy Ghost is here a Person whose will it is to manifest Himself: He has a manifestation even as the Son has. And in the dispensation of the gifts which He imparts He is at once the Administrator of the Trinity, of the Same God Which worketh all in all, and the personal Agent of His own will 1 1 Corinthians 12:4-11

26. Vol 02 - The Gospel Vocation

The Gospel Vocation THE GOSPEL VOCATION:

VOCATION AND UNIVERSAL REDEMPTION Mystery of Gradual Development HISTORICAL PROCESS

Universal Call

Indirect Gospel Vocation Direct Old-Testament Election and Calling New-Testament Calling and Election THE NATURE OF THE GOSPEL CALL

Proclamation

Offer Command

Spirit

Word

Church

Vocatio Seria Election and Effectual Calling Resistible, Contingency and Reprobation HISTORY OF CONTROVERSY In the New Testament

Early Church Augustinian Doctrine

Mediaeval Calvinism and Reformed Confessions Modifications of Calvinism Lutheranism and its Modifications Arminianism and its Modifications The Divine purpose of saving the world, accomplished in Christ, is made known to all men by a proclamation which, as containing the free offer of grace, and the command to accept it on certain conditions, is a Vocation or Call. However profound is the mystery involved in such a thought, that call must needs, in some sense, be as universal as the benefit of atonement, which embraces mankind. But it has had, in the mystery of the Divine will, an historical development. Before the fullness of time it proceeded by a principle of election on which vocation followed; but, under the last dispensation, the call is as wide as the preaching of the Gospel, and election follows vocation. In this meaning of the term, with which alone we now have to do, the Spirit’s calling is efficacious, inasmuch as through the Word He renders all men who hear that Word conscious of their responsibility, and capable of obedience; but it is not irresistible. In the case of those who accept the Divine offer, the term is often used to express their Christian state and privileges generally: it gives them one of their designations as The Called The three words kalein to call, kleesis vocation, and kleetos called, refer respectively to the Caller, the act of calling, and the result. The present section has mainly to do with the act and not with the result: the latter belonging rather to the Spirit’s work in the preliminaries of salvation. It is obvious, also, that our subject must take no account of some limited applications of the word: for instance, those in which it refers to the Divine power calling those things which be not as though they were;1 those in which it is used as meaning simply designation, as I have even called thee by

thy name;2 and, lastly, those in which it signifies a vocation to special office, such as that of St. Paul called to be an Apostle3 of the apostleship. Though the distinction cannot be rigorously observed, we must limit the term as much as possible to the declaration of God concerning His purpose of salvation; and, while we do so, remember that we are dealing with a subject which is at present involved in impenetrable mystery 1 Romans 4:17; 2 Isaiah 45:4; 3 Romans 1:1 VOCATION AND UNIVERSAL REDEMPTION The Divine call is based upon the Divine counsel for the salvation of mankind. This involves two important postulates. It requires, first, that we believe in the universality of the call, whatever difficulties this faith may encounter; and, secondly, it prepares us to expect that the call will, like the purpose of redemption, be gradually made manifest to all men

1. Scripture establishes, as we have seen, the fact that the eternal purpose of redemption embraced the entire body of mankind. God so loved the world,1 that He willeth all men to be saved.2 But there is only a step, and that a necessary one, to the universal declaration of His will in His Son. The Creator loved the world before He declared His love in Christ; He declared His will to save all, and that will is connected with the fundamental truth that as there is one God, so also there is one Mediator between God and man, that Mediator being Jesus Christ, Man, the Representative of mankind. What St. Paul, in his last word on this subject, calls the Philanthropy, or the kindness and love of God our Savior towardMan 1:3 as such, appeared in the Gospel, no less than a catholic love to the entire race: the word philanthropia is the plainest and strongest argument for the universality of the salvation provided. Now, whatever difficulties may arise to baffle our finite faculties, we are bound to believe that the whole world, directly or indirectly, sooner or later, must receive the glad tidings of the Gospel 1 John 3:16; 2 1 Timothy 2:4; 3 Titus 3:4

2. As it has pleased God to make the revelation of His purpose gradual, so we might expect that the proclamation of His mercy in accordance with that purpose would be gradual. In fact the two are one; and they are united in many passages. Its slow and partial and progressive announcement is bound up with the gradual development of the design of salvation itself. Here two things may be noted. The law of the Divine economy, according to which the education of fallen mankind has been conducted by a development of truth, and the orderly unfolding of one great mediatorial system, admits of no exception to it, and no appeal from it. But the gradual and slow progress of the call has reference only to the external proclamation. Known only to God are His internal communications with the spirits of men HISTORICAL PROCESS The Divine Call, keeping pace with the unfolding of the redeeming purpose, is with reference to all mankind, and apart from revelation, general and indirect: in the universal influence of the Spirit upon the fallen spirits of men, and in His providential guidance of the nations. The direct Call through the Word has been twofold: first, during the ages of preparation, it was spoken to the people of the old covenant and of the election; secondly, in Christ Jesus, it is the Gospel Call proper addressed to all mankind, leading to the election of those who believe THE INDIRECT CALL The Universal Call, Vocatio Catholica, is that by which the Holy Spirit has moved upon the chaos of the nations through a secret influence to which the term call is only improperly applied. Whatever name, however, is applied to it there can be no doubt that the world has been under the secret and mysterious attraction of grace from the beginning, over and above the interior Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.1 1 John 1:9

1. The influence of the Holy Ghost, the gift of redemption to the fallen race, must not be limited. We have intimations in the early Scriptures that the Spirit strove WITH MAN;1 throughout the Old Testament the rebellious vexed His Holy Spirit;2 and, though this was the special sin of the ancient people, we must assume that it was the secret of the commencing ungodliness of the world at large. In the New Testament we are told that the Gentiles universally had the law of God written in their hearts:3 and certainly there has been no universal sense of truth but as the fruit of the influence of Him who is the Spirit of the truth.4 He in every age HATH SHOWED5 it unto them 1 Genesis 6:3; 2 Isaiah 63:10; 3 Romans 2:15; 4 John 16:13; John 5:1-47Romans 1:19; 2. The early revelation which was given to the world before the first dispersion of its inhabitants was a sound that went into all the earth:1 issuing from the household of Adam and afterwards from that of Noah. And, however perverted became the traditions of primeval truth, they were in a certain sense a constant appeal to the world to remember its Creator in the days of its youth. In like manner, and this may be referred to by way of analogy, the most corrupt presentation of the Gospel in the darkest ages of Christendom carried with it the word of life

1 Romans 10:18

3. Moreover St. Paul tells us, in one of the few early discourses to the Gentiles that are recorded, of God’s providential call to all nations. Nevertheless He left not Himself without witness.1 How this catholic preacher of a Catholic Christianity elsewhere dilated upon this theme we know not. But these words have a large meaning; and, if we collate the preacher in the Acts with the teacher to the Romans, we shall gather that the Apostle of the Gentiles magnified his office in this sense also

1 Acts 14:17 THE DIRECT CALL The history of the Gospel vocation, as direct through the Word, is in Scripture divided into two branches. In the Old Testament it was limited to one race, first elected and then called; in the New Testament it is universally to all men, first called arid then elected: a distinction of great importance

I. The Vocation of Abraham is the central point of Old-Covenant Election. But this looks back upon a previous historical development of the principle, and looks forward to its consummation and change in the Gospel

1. In the two sons of our first parents the separation of God’s people had its first type; and in the salvation of one family the Flood was the second. Between the sons of Noah God put a difference not altogether dependent upon their several personal acts; and the special vocation followed a special election. For, though the dealings of God with the two classes respectively had reference to their moral character, especially as it respects the leading personages, such as Shem and Noah, yet we cannot but discern a direct and sovereign election of the peoples and nations who should carry on His central design

2. The call of Abraham was the choice of a covenant people. With him this special national or race election specifically began. The words of Jehovah to the children of Israel, the whole family which I brought up from the land of Egypt, saying, you only have I known of all the families of the earth,1 is the strongest expression of the fact. This election, as in the New Testament, is adoption: Israel is My son, even My firstborn.2 Hence the people thus distinguished were the peculiar people.3 The thought has a striking illustration in the words of the prophet concerning the typical chosen nation: When Israel was a child then I loved him, and called My son out of Egypt;4 where the election is

followed by vocation and adoption 1 Amos 3:1-2; 2 Exodus 4:22; 3 Deuteronomy 14:2; 4 Hosea 11:1

3. Throughout the development of the Old-Testament Election there runs the mystery of a Divine purpose of unfathomable wisdom; in the contemplation of which, however, two things must be remembered: first, that this choice was never altogether without respect to the moral character of its objects, and, secondly, that it always was connected with a prophecy of a universal call in the Gospel. Though the Supreme God used occasionally the instrumentality of the ungodly He carried on the great purposes of His grace by men who responded to His internal call, and were morally fit agents of His will. Abel, Noah, Abraham, are instances of this; nor is Jacob an exception. It is true that the gifts and calling of God are without repentance;1 and that, having chosen a lineage out of which His Son should arise, He did not vary from His purpose in consequence of much unfaithfulness on the part of the elect people. But it is true also that the leading personages on whom the absolute election fell were among the foremost saints of history

Moreover, in His government of the people of His special election God was a jealous God; and often chastised them by the very heathen whom He passed by in their favor

Above all, He failed not always to let them know that they were only the temporary Election of His counsel, and that His Name should one day be great among the Gentiles.2 But, after every qualification, the profound mystery remains untaken away, nor is it altogether removed in the more catholic dispensation of the Gospel 1 Romans 11:29; 2 Malachi 1:11

II. The direct call of the Gospel after the coming of Christ, or rather after the Day of Pentecost, is distinguished from that of the Old Testament by not being national, and by preceding the election. But this leads us onward to the nature of the vocation itself THE NATURE OF THE GOSPEL CALL The Gospel Call is the universal offer of salvation and command to submit to its Author; proclaimed by the Spirit through the Word committed to the keeping and ministry of the Christian Church; containing the glad tidings of the earnest purpose of God towards every individual of mankind; effectual through the Spirit’s grace to all who yield; but declared not to be irresistible, and in fact resisted, even finally resisted, by unbelief THE OFFER OF SALVATION The Call is the PROCLAMATION of the redemption accomplished by Christ; the OFFER of its blessings on certain conditions; and the COMMAND to submit to the authority of Christ the Mediator of these blessings. These three are one in the embassage of the New Covenant; and the Gospel is not fully preached unless equal prominence is given to all The model of this preaching is found in the Acts of the Apostles, where St. Peter and St Paul are the leading examples. The Proclamation and the Offer and the Command must be united in every true delivery of the Gospel Call, as they are invariably united in the original examples. The first sound of that Vocation ends with such a note as this: and we are His witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, Whom God hath given to them that obey Him.1 Here are the three elements to which we have given prominence: the testimony given; the terms prescribed; and the submission demanded. St. Paul’s first recorded sermon contains them all with equal precision: Be it known unto you, . . . all that believe; . . . beware therefore!2 Were there no theory to be served it must be admitted that the call of the Gospel is a witness to everyone of a blessing offered on terms open to all, and enforced by a command to submit to the Mediatorial Authority of Him Who is raised up to dispense it. The NAME is preached as a Testimony of salvation, as the Object of faith, and the Authority to which universal

submission is due 1 Acts 5:32; 2 Acts 13:38-40 IN THE CHURCH THROUGH THE WORD The second proposition contains three points: the Spirit is the Agent of the Call: it is connected with the Word; and that Word is ordinarily committed to the ministry of the Christian Church. The doctrine of the Gospel Vocation demands a careful adjustment of the relations of these three

I. Generally, He Who calleth is God, though not specifically as the Father. We preached unto you the Gospel of God—a phrase which seldom occurs—Who hath called you unto His kingdom and glory.1 Christ also, though only as upon earth, declares: I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.2 The Holy Spirit is now permanently the manifestation of the God of the Gospel Vocation: The Spirit and the Bride say, Come,3 where the invitation to sinners follows the invocation of the Lord Himself to return. He is the Preacher in the name of Christ to the world: He shall testify of Me.4 But this in the unity of the Three-One Author of redemption: All things that the Father hath are Mine: therefore said I, that He shall take of Mine, and shall show it unto you.5 1 1 Thessalonians 2:9-12; 2 Matthew 9:13; 3 Revelation 22:17; 4 John 15:26; 5 John 16:15

II. The call of the Gospel is ordinarily through the Word, But the Word is both the letter and the substance of the letter: these are united in the instrument which the Holy Ghost employs

1. St. Paul says that faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God,1 where he evidently means the doctrine preached: the summary of truths as the truth is in Jesus.2 That the Gospel proclamation is intended seems obvious from the connection of that word with what precedes: How shall they hear without a preacher?3 But there is a substantial truth of which the Word written or spoken is only the vehicle. Hence the Apostle adds: Yes verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world.4 And the original passage of the prophet proves that there is a voice of God's Will which is not in written language: I was made manifest unto them that asked not after Me.5 In this sense there may be a Word without the Word.6 1 Romans 10:17; 2 Ephesians 4:21; 3 Romans 10:14; 4 Romans 10:18; 5 Isaiah 65:1; 6 1 Peter 3:1

2. Now the call through the Gospel is not limited either to the oral or to the written announcement. It is a silent effectual voice accompanying the truth, wherever the truth is The Holy Ghost is the Life of the doctrine which is the letter; and most certainly the letter is never without the accompanying Spirit. The letter is not only written; there may be a spoken letter also. Wherever the truth is declared in the name of Jesus it is the instrument of His energy. But the Spirit is not dependent either on the written or on the spoken letter as such. It is the truth which He uses as His instrument. He is the Spirit of truth.1

1 John 16:13

III. The relation of the Church to the Spirit's efficiency through the Word is everywhere made prominent in the New Testament. The Savior gave His commission unto the Apostles whom He had chosen.1 Their authority He declared to be from Himself and the reflection or continuation of His own: As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you.2 The extent of their commission is all nations; and the matter of the vocation is the preaching the Gospel to every creature.3 These Apostles to whom the Lord gave commandment themselves in turn gave commandment through the Holy Ghost4 to their successors as responsible for preaching that Gospel to the end of time. But the call is committed really to the Church in a wider sense than this: all who receive the glad

tidings must freely give as they have freely received. We read in the Acts that the Dispersed went about preaching the Word.5 And the very last saying of Scripture on the subject is The Spirit and the Bride say, Come,6 where the mystical fellowship is represented as uniting with the Spirit in beseeching the Savior to come to His people, and in beseeching all who thirst to come to Him. This general truth may be further unfolded as pointing to the mystery of the Divine law of vocation; impressing deeply the responsibility of the Church; and carrying in it the prophecy of the eventual proclamation of the Gospel to all men 1 Acts 1:2; 2 John 20:21; 3 Matthew 28:19; 4 Acts 1:2; 5 Acts 8:4; 6 Revelation 22:17

1. In every age the work of the Spirit in extending the Kingdom of God has been bound up with human agency. Individuals in the old economy were prominent in every dispensation of it, teaching His will and uttering His prophetic words and carrying on His work generally. The history of ancient revelation is bound up with a series of eminent men; and not only individuals but the covenant nation itself was elected and called to preach in some sense to the outside world His present and coming Kingdom. The Christian dispensation has introduced no new law: it has only widened the application of the law that operated from the beginning. As Man was taken up into the Godhead to be the procurer of redemption, so that Man who is God uses His brethren for the diffusion of His grace

2. There is no fact more sure, while there is no mystery more profound, than the connection between the fidelity of the Church and the spread of Christ's kingdom. The Call is heard where the Church sends it; but where the messengers are not sent from among men, there are no angels having an eternal Gospel to proclaim.1 How shall they hear without a preacher?2 was a question which might leave all to the secret arrangements of arbitrary grace. But it is followed by another, which leaves the responsibility with the living Church: How shall they preach except they be sent?3 Not indeed that the Holy Spirit is, or has ever been, absolutely bound to human instrumentality. The dew of His grace tarrieth not for man, nor waiteth for the sons of men;4 but the gradual and slow spread of Gospel preaching most plainly shows that the energy of the Church has much to do with the term of the final consummation. Our Lord must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet;5 but He does not wait for any set time apart from the accomplishment of His Church's mission. Though we dare not limit the operation of grace to the sphere of missionary preaching, we know of no Christianity which the successors of the Apostles do not establish. Hence it is well to fall back upon a double call, — not so dishonorable to the Divine perfections as the external and internal, the former resting on an official will of Heaven, so to speak, and the latter on the private feeling of our heavenly Father, —one that is open and known and another that is hidden and unknown. There is a secret call in which generally speaking man is not co-operant: which, like the sun, extends its influence to the evil and the good 1 Revelation 14:6; 2 Romans 10:14; 3 Romans 10:15; 4 Micah 5:7; 5 1 Corinthians 15:25

3. Nothing is more certain in prophecy than that the Vocation of the Gospel in its stricter meaning shall be universal. Both the Old Testament and the New concur to present a perspective in which this Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a testimony unto all the nations; and then shall the end come.1 1 Matthew 24:14 THE DIVINE INTENTION IN THE CALL

We may pass with more confidence to the third proposition. The Gospel Call contains the earnest purpose of God to save every man who hears it

1. Here if anywhere the a priori style of argument is valid. However the contrary assertion may be disguised it involves dishonor to the truth and faithfulness of God

Many mysteries crowd around the subject, beneath which our reason must bow down; but the superfluous mystery that makes the Righteous Judge utter the gracious offers of His mercy with a secret reserve is one from which every feeling of our reverence and charity recoils. The teaching that finds it necessary to distinguish between an official call for all men and an efficacious call for the elect is self-condemned

2. We need not defend the honor of God: we have only to interpret His sayings. Our Lord's words ought to be enough: Compel them to come in!1 illustrated as they are by His sorrow over Jerusalem: How often would I! and ye would not!2 And our Lord's will is the will of God, Who will have all men to be saved.3 Who in the Old Testament said, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live.4 In the New Testament the Gospel is the appearance of the kindness and love of God our Savior towardMan 1:5 or His philanthropy 1 Luke 14:23; 2 Matthew 23:37; 3 1 Timothy 2:4; 4 Ezekiel 33:11; 5 Titus 3:4

3. Such a genuine call implies that the offer of salvation is always accompanied by sufficient grace for its acceptance. This has already been seen in relation to the Word, and will again be considered in the next topic of Preliminary Grace. Meanwhile, there is no need of argument; nor is any specific text necessary. Every Divine commandment is virtually a commandment with promise: with promise not only of blessing to follow obedience but of grace to precede it. The Gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth.1 By the special appointment and will of God the Word has grace connected with it, sufficient for every purpose for which it is sent. So it was anciently said: it shall not return unto Me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please.2 1 Romans 1:16; 2 Isaiah 55:11 CALLING AND ELECTION

Those who accept the Divine call through the Word are in the language of Scripture the Elect. And both terms, Calling and Election, or the Called and the Elect, are sometimes used to designate the Christian Estate as such

1. Of a Vocatio Interna, as distinguished from the Vocatio Externa, there is no trace in Scripture: INTERNAL CALLING and EFFECTUAL CALLING are phrases never used. The distinction implies such a difference as would have been clearly stated if it existed; and all that is meant by the internal call finds its expression, as we shall see, in other offices of the Holy Spirit of enlightenment, conviction, and conversion. Each of these terms carries the meaning of an external summons made effectual by interior grace; but never in the sense that sufficient interior grace is denied to any. It may be said that the true internal vocation is election in the strict sense. Many be called, but few chosen.1 This states a fact over which the Savior mourns. I have chosen you out of the world.2 This states a fact over which the Savior rejoices. The term, however, is used in some passages with the same wide application as the term call: for instance, God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise,3 and have not I chosen you twelve?4 While therefore our Saviour's first word establishes the distinction, and we are warranted in saying that election is the result of accepting the call, we must remember that the New Testament often uses the terms interchangeably. Election always presupposes the call; but the call does not always issue in election 1 Matthew 20:16; 2 John 15:19; 3 1 Corinthians 1:27; 4 John 6:70

2. The acceptance of the Call, and the Election that follows it, are both metonymically used to designate the state of Christians, presumed according to their profession to stand in the grace of God. They are The Called of Jesus Christ . . . beloved of God, called to be saints,1 or called saints. Christians are Saints by designation as well as by internal character; and they are called by designation, as having accepted the external appeal. So also they are the Elect as separated from the world both outwardly and inwardly. St. Peter writes his Catholic Epistle to The Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father,2 whom he terms a chosen generation. St. Paul speaks of the faith of God's elect;3 and St. John of thy elect sister.4 The phrase The Election5 is used for the company of God's chosen among the Jews; but not now generally of all Christians. God's Elect,6 or The Elect of God,7 are those who belong to the household of faith. The predominant allusion in the Word is to the collective character of the Church which has taken the place of the privileged nation; and that governs the use of the term everywhere, precisely like the denomination the Sanctified or the Saints. Christians are the Election of Grace8 in opposition to the ancient people gathered out of the world; they are the sanctified as separated, instead of them, to God. The word Church or Ecclesia literally means the same as The Called and the Elect: it expresses the result of that which Election means as in the purpose of God

1 Romans 1:6-7; 2 1 Peter 1:1; 1 Peter 2:9; 3 Titus 1:1; 4 2 John 1:13; 5 Romans 11:7; 6 Romans 8:33; 7 Colossians 3:12; 8 Romans 11:5

CONTINGENCY The Gospel Call may be resisted and finally resisted; even the Election connected with it may after obedience be forfeited; and, with regard to both classes of the disobedient, the term reprobation is used, though never as the result of a fixed decree

1. Many are called, but few chosen.1 This word, if genuine in the text, should be an end of all controversy, as explained by our Lord Himself: Ye will not come to Me.2 There is nothing more constantly and consistently declared in the older and later Scriptures than the power of man to oppose and oppose successfully the influence of grace. Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost!3 Surely it is dishonorable to the name of God to suppose that He would charge on sinners a resistance which was to them a necessity, and complain of outrage on His Spirit Whose influences were only partially put forth 1 Matthew 20:16; 2 John 5:40; 3 Acts 7:51

2. There are some passages of Scripture which indicate that the blessings of Election itself may be forfeited: this sacred word is not shielded, nor is its special grace inviolable

Judas was one of the elect: have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?1 When our Lord speaks of the very elect being deceived, if it were possible.2 He does not intimate that delusion leading to apostasy was impossible in their case. Though the words might seem to bear that meaning, we must otherwise interpret them. For, at the commencement of the discourse He had said: Take heed that no man deceive you! and at the close, He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.3 St. Peter, whose Epistles dwell much on the privileges of the Election, does not number among those privileges the security against falling: on the contrary he bids his readers give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall, or, rather, stumble.4 1 John 6:70; 2 Matthew 24:24; 3 Matthew 24:4; Matthew 24:13; 4 2 Peter 1:10

3. Lastly, the Word of God speaks of the possible Reprobation of both these classes, — the Called and the Chosen—but of the reprobation of no other. The vocation of the Word is a mysterious test of their state before God and the truth; and they have failed to sustain that test. They are adokimoi (1.) The called who resist are reprobates. God gave them over to a reprobate mind who did not like to retain God in their knowledge.1 They who resist the truth are the reprobate concerning the faith.2 (2.) St. Paul speaks of the possibility of the saints being reprobates: Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobate?3 When we read of the final signature of the called and chosen and faithful4 we are taught that the end is not yet when the called are also chosen. The third word in the great sentence remains: fidelity must seal the eternal grace of election. (3.) There is no reprobation as fixed in the decree of God throughout the Scriptures of mercy and truth. The idea is inconsistent with every-thing but a probation and a willful failure in probation 1 Romans 1:28; 2 2 Timothy 3:8; 3 2 Corinthians 8:5; 4 Revelation 17:14 HISTORY OF CONTROVERSY A few observations may be made on the Polemics of this question: limited to that branch of it which concerns Vocation and Election. It is with the perversion of the Predestination idea that we have mainly to do

I. Within the

New Testament itself there is a remarkable anticipation of the modern controversy. The preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles was resented by the Jewish Christians, by those of a certain party especially, as an invasion of the privileges, or advantages, of the covenant people as the Elect of God. There was no saying which they more disapproved than St. Paul's Lo, we turn to the Gentiles.1 In his Epistle to the Romans the Apostle of the Gentiles argues against these advocates of an unconditional election, these earliest perverters of the true doctrine of the decretive will of God. It must be always remembered that this was the object for which he wrote the Three Chapters which the Predestinarians have taken refuge in: they were written in fact as a proleptical refutation of such views. The special exegesis on which a vindication of this assertion depends is not necessary here. Suffice that St. Paul admits, as we have already seen, that the ancient election was of a particular line through which the revelation of the preparatory Gospel was to be transmitted, and in which the Author of that Gospel was to appear. Undoubtedly, it is hard for human reason to distinguish between the national and the individual election, and between the active and the permissive will of God in the hardening of evil men; but the distinction must be made. Such passages as Therefore hath He mercy on whom He will have mercy,2 on the one hand, and the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction, on the other, are not to be understood of absolute predetermination of individuals to be saved or to be lost. The similitude of the Potter and the clay as more fully seen in Jeremiah ends with a direct refutation of the notion: there the decrees of God are said to be changed by the characters of men. 0 house of Israel, cannot I do with you as this potter? saith the Lord. At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them.3 The whole argument of St. Paul is to show that the election of Israel as a nation had not come to naught: it was not of works, but of Him that calleth.4 The Three Chapters carefully studied yield conclusions in favor of a national election but not of an individual: especially when they are connected with the intermediate chapter in which we have the Apostle's glorious protest against the perversion of his teaching: the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon Him. For

whosoever shall call upon the Name of the Lord shall be saved . . .. But to Israel He saith, All day long have I stretched forth My hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.5 1 Acts 13:46; 2 Romans 9:18; Romans 9:22; 3 Jeremiah 18:6-8; 4 Romans 9:11; 5 Romans 10:12-13; Romans 10:21

II. The entire Christian community down to the time of Augustine knew in its doctrine no other election and predestination than what was conditional or, what is the same thing, of none which do not refer to the ideal Body of Christ as such. The tendency of the Easterns especially was to lay too much rather than too little emphasis on the foreknowledge of human repentance and faith. Chrysostom says: " Not of love alone, but of our virtue also

If it sprang from love alone all would have been saved. If from our virtue alone that would be little and all would be lost. It was from neither alone, but from both: for the Calling was not of necessity or of force." This sentence represents the sentiment of the Greek Church from Origen to Athanasius, and even John of Damascus, the last of the Oriental Fathers proper. There was a decided leaning to an exaggeration of the freedom of the human will: at least their doctrine was not sufficiently protected by any reference to the ever-active influence of the Holy Ghost upon our fallen nature. But, whatever their theoretical notions were of the universality of the Gospel vocation, their Missionary zeal declined after the ninth century, and they have contributed little to the evangelization of the world

III. Augustine first laid down the principle that " Predestination is the preparation of grace; grace the bestowment itself." 1. The foundation of his whole system is his doctrine of Original Sin, which regards all mankind as utterly bereft of capacity for good: a "mass of perdition," a "condemned lump." Therefore salvation is absolutely of grace, and without human co-operation. To this great principle there can be no objection. Nature cannot cast out nature; and the human fall was a fall into utter impotence. But Augustine forgot that the first benefit of redemption was co-extensive with the ruin of man. Perhaps, indeed, he held this; but in a sense of his own. That benefit was in his teaching a wasted and useless influence save to the elect. He taught that the Divine eternal decree determined the exact number of those to whom efficacious grace, which includes an irresistible grace for the beginning and the grace of perseverance for the close, shall be given. For these alone the Redeemer may be said to have died: " Everyone that has been redeemed by the blood of Christ is a man; though not everyone that is a man has been redeemed by the blood of Christ." " The Savior redeemed the sinners who were to be justified," and " No one perishes for whom the Savior died." 2. Some of the difficulties connected with the Gospel Call in this doctrine were summarily disposed of by Augustine, but only through renouncing that principle of an inextinguishable life of regeneration which his followers now hold so firmly. All who hear and receive the Gospel and are baptized receive regenerating grace, and are placed in a state of salvation: this explains the universal offer of the Gospel and the equally universal administration of the sacrament. But to the Elect only is the gift of perseverance imparted, and the objects of the Donum Perseverantiae are known to God alone: this protects the doctrine of the eternal decree. " Those who fall are not to be reckoned in the number of the elect, even as to the time when they lived piously. There are sons of God, not yet such to us but such to God; and there are again some who are called by us sons of God on account of grace temporarily received, but not so by Him." Other difficulties Augustine does not attempt to solve. He has no more to say concerning the hidden decree than that " God divided the light from the darkness; and so ordered the Fall that He

might first show what the free will of man could do, and then what His grace could do." Nor has he any solution of the difficulty that the electing grace of God should be connected with sacraments and bound to a system of external ordinances. A thousand years afterwards Calvin arose to confront more boldly these and all other difficulties: not cramped by the Sacramentarian theory which hampered his great predecessor

IV. During that long interval Predestinarianism, or Augustinianism, passed through many vicissitudes. The Semipelagians asserted an election of believers as foreknown, thus giving a formula which has been ever since found useful; and the Synod of Orange (A.D. 529) condemned the dogma of predestination to evil or reprobation. In the ninth century Gottschalk carried the doctrine of Augustine to its extremist limits, limits which it was not again to reach until the modern representative of the Predestinarian Father arose. His teaching was rejected at Mainz (A.D. 848), but acknowledged at Valence (A.D. 855): "Fatemur praedestinationem electorum ad vitam, et praedestinationem impiorum ad mortem," a confession, however, in which, rightly understood, all may unite. On the side of Gottschalk was Ratramnus, against him Hinckmar. It may be said that throughout the mediaeval discussions of this and kindred subjects the tendency was in a direction opposite to that of predestinarianism. And, moreover, that the ever-growing theory of a kingdom of Christ, under one vicar, predestined to embrace the world, was itself unfavorable to any limitation of the Gospel vocation. The mediaeval Church at the worst was in spirit and practice missionary. Universal missions and a partial Call can never rationally co-exist V. At the Reformation the doctrine of Election and the Limited Call seemed likely to be in the ascendant everywhere

1. Zwingli and Calvin united in reviving the Augustinian doctrine of an individual vocation determined by a predestinating decree; but Calvin has given a permanent name to the system, because in fact he gave it a distinguishing character. He laid his foundation deeper than that of his forerunner. Augustine made the Eternal Decree his central point; Calvin carried it up to the Absolute Being, or Absolute Sovereignty, of God, from which that decree flowed. These are some of his words: Praedestinationem vocamus aeternum Dei decretum, quo apud se constitutum habuit quid de UNOQUOQUE homine fieri vellet Dico Deum non modo primi hominis casum et in eo posterorum ruinam praevidisse, sed arbitrio quoque suo dispensasse. " Man falls by the providence of God so ordaining, but he falls through his own wickedness." All is of the absolute, unquestionable, despotic sovereignty of God. If human, reason suggests a demur, "Respondendum est: quia voluit!" The decree was Supralapsarian, that is, it included the Fall, which Augustine never asserts formally. It follows from this in the system of Calvin that the external call of the Gospel is an unmeaning ceremonial save as to the elect. The word and the means of grace are to all others "Signa inania:" the manifestations of a "Voluntas signi," which, signifying nothing but " Common Grace," must be distinguished from the hidden " Voluntas beneplaciti" on which the salvation of every man depends. Here is the secret of Predestinarianism, whatever other name it may bear: the secret that links it with Fatalism, with philosophic Determinism, with Pantheism, with the modern notion of Abstract Law or the Absolute Fiat of a Being who is not so much a Person as a Will. Other relations of this creed to theological doctrine, subordinate relations introduced in due course, all find their vanishing point in this Unconditioned and Unconditional Sovereignty, which is the foundation and top-stone of the whole superstructure

2. The Reformed Confessions assert this doctrine, though with some variations: variations, however, which introduce qualifying clauses having no real meaning, and may be left to the

symbolical Volumes. Some are of a more extreme type, approaching, though not positively expressing, the Supralapsarian theory, that the Fall was included in the decree of God; others are more evidently Infralapsarian, dating the decree as it were this side of the Fall. The Synod of Dort, 1618, in opposition to the Remonstrants, digested the Calvinistic doctrine in a large number of canons, which seem to be based on the latter scheme. It thus speaks concerning the Vocation of the Gospel: " Though all men sinned in Adam and were made guilty of malediction and eternal death, God would have done injury to no one if He had willed to leave the entire human race in sin and the curse, and to condemn it on account of that sin . . .. But that men may be led to faith God mercifully sends the heralds of His most joyful tidings to whom He will and when He will, by whose ministry men are called to repentance and faith in Christ . . .. That some are gifted with faith in time, and others not, springs from His eternal decree, . . .according to which He graciously softens the hearts of the elect, however hard, and bends them to belief, but in His just judgment leaves the non-elect to the consequences of their own wickedness and obduracy." These Articles, nearly a hundred in number, are generally received by the Predestinarian Churches as a full statement of the Christian Faith. The English version of the same creed is found in the Westminster Confession, drawn up for the purpose of reforming the English Church between 1643 and 1648: it is a reflection of the Dort Canons, and accepted by the Presbyterians of the British Islands and America

Many of the Reformed Confessions, like that of the English Church, mitigate the dogma of predestination, and use such language as may be without much violence reconciled with Scripture, especially in their reference to the universality and sincerity of the Call Others of them are more predestinarian than they appear to be: ambiguity of phrase disguising their meaning

3. Modifications of the Calvinistic creed are as various as the lands which it has penetrated. Calvin himself protested unconsciously against all among his followers who should soften his system of doctrine: " Many so preach election as to deny that any man is reprobated; but very ignorantly and childishly, since election itself would not stand unless opposed to reprobation." Thus the modern Father of Predestination condemned beforehand the devices of his more generous or less unrelenting successors: rather their device, for all the sophistries of palliation may be regarded as one. In France, towards the middle of the seventeenth century, Amyraldus taught that salvation was provided for all men; that God elected some to whom was given the necessary grace of repentance and faith; and that all others are simply left without a special determining influence which none have a right to claim. This useless subterfuge was resorted to in England by Richard Baxter; and has in more recent times been advocated in Scotland. It is the unacknowledged creed of great numbers who are bound to the general teaching of predestinariamsm, but feel constrained to preach the Gospel freely to all: some because the New Testament exhibits that kind of preaching, and they dare not contradict its example; some because they think that the reprobate are predoomed to reject the Gospel as well as to perish without atonement; and some because their ardent charity melts the fetters of their creed VI. The Lutheran doctrine passed through stages of fluctuation

1. Both Luther and Melanchthon were at first predestinarian in their views of the Gospel Call. They taught Determinism or Fatalism almost in the same words as Calvin used; but both gradually modified and finally retracted these views, induced mainly by the impossibility of reconciling them with the serious purpose of God in universally proffering salvation, and with the evangelical

scheme of the means of grace. It may be said generally that the followers of Luther are not of the school of Augustine

2. Hence the Lutheran Formularies are not predestinarian. The Formula Concordise was the first public document that dealt at large with the subject. The following is a translation of sentences which treat, of Election and Vocation: " Predestination or the eternal Divine election pertains only to the good and accepted sons of God, and it is the cause of their salvation. It procures their renewal and disposes of all things which belong to it . . .. This predestination is not to be scrutinized in the secret of the Divine counsel, but is to be sought in the Word of God, which reveals it. The Word of God leads us to Christ . . .. But Christ calls all sinners to Himself, and promises them rest, and seriously wills that all men should come to Him and yield themselves to be aided and saved. The true doctrine of predestination is to be learned from the nature of the Gospel of Christ

There it is plainly taught that God has concluded all under unbelief that He might have mercy on all, and that He wills none to perish, but rather that all should be converted and believe the Gospel . . .. When it is said that many are called but few are chosen,1 it is not to be understood that God is unwilling that all should be saved; but it indicates the cause of the perdition of the ungodly, which is this, that they either fail altogether to hear the Word of God, rebelliously despising it by closing their ears and hardening their hearts, and in this way hindering the ordinary method of the Holy Spirit, so that He cannot effect His work on them, or that they esteem lightly the word they hear and cast it away from them. Their perishing must be ascribed, not to God and His election, but to their own malignity." Thus the official doctrine of the Lutheran Church omits the reprobation of the wicked, and makes the predestination of the believer dependent on the foresight of faith and perseverance. The Call of the Gospel it regards as universal, serious, and efficacious: offering sufficient grace to all who hear the Word, whether they accept it or not. As in the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist all who partake receive the glorified body of the Lord, some to salvation and others to condemnation, so all who hear the Gospel receive its saving word, some to the saving of their souls, and some to their aggravated doom

1 Matthew 22:14

3. The later development of Lutheran teaching has been faithful to these statements, but has expanded them so as to touch some of the pressing difficulties which crowd around the question

(1.) The earlier dogmatic writers laid emphasis on the "voluntas antecedens," which is the Divine decree of salvation in Christ expressing His "voluntas universalis, gratuita et seria." This counsel when viewed in the light of foreknowledge is translated into a " voluntas consequens seu specialis “: not as if there were two wills in God; but the one supreme will is determined distributively in regard to the two classes of believers and unbelievers

Hence the universal will may be regarded as rather that of mercy, the special will as rather that of justice. Later Lutheran theologians have preferred to dwell more on the election of a new humanity in Christ into the fellowship of which only those enter who believe:’ the whole emphasis of election rests on the second race of which the Second Adam is the Head. The special predestination of individuals is only the historical realization of the eternal purpose of love in Christ

(2.) Again, the first Lutheran doctors explained the absolute universality of the Call by a reference to the three great historical crises when the evangelical appeal went forth without limitation to the nations of the earth: first, when the universal Promise concerning the Seed of the woman, the Serpent-Bruiser, passed out into all the world and down to all posterity; secondly, when the preaching of Noah after the Flood again sent its sound into all the earth to be molded into universal traditions; and, thirdly, when the worldwide preaching of the Apostles literally went out without restriction: " quo non venit apostolee eo epistolee." This solution has a fair show of theoretic completeness, and of striking generalization; but it leaves unsolved the mystery that the posterity of those who rejected this triple testimony are yet without the Gospel, as well as the still profounder mystery that the publication of the world's glad tidings should have been left contingent in any degree whatever on the fidelity of the missionary church. Some more modern speculative theologians have had recourse to other expedients; among which is the notion of a Gospel preached in the intermediate state to those who have either rejected it in this life or insufficiently heard it: a notion which, based on St. Peter's testimony to the Saviour's Missionary Descent into Hades, is capable of almost unlimited expansion and application within the interval down to the Day of Judgment. But this subject belongs rather to Eschatology

VII. The Remonstrants of Holland, or Arminians, endeavored to introduce into the Reformed Church the Scriptural doctrine. But in vain: the Synod of Dort (1618, 1619) rejected their Remonstrance against a limiting of Divine grace, just as the Council of Trent in the previous century rejected the remonstrance of Protestantism against another and an opposite kind of dishonor done to the grace of God. From that time the doctrine of a Universal Atonement, or of a Savior provided for the race and for sin universally, with the concomitant doctrine of a free and unreserved offer of grace to all who hear the Word, has been connected with the name of Arminianism. But this is an injustice to these doctrines themselves, which have a higher parentage. The Calvinism of modern times was the Augustinianism of the fifth century: it has no higher origin. It was Augustine who first dared so to interpret Scripture as to attach a limited design to the death of Christ: the Fathers who preceded him were generally faithful to the catholic Gospel; or, if they erred, it was like Origen, in making the mission of Christ too comprehensive in its benefits

Conversely, Augustinianism may in modern times be called Calvinism; for it has never prevailed outside of the Churches of the Reformed or Calvinistic type: its sporadic existence in the JANSENISM of Rome is hardly an exception. The term Calvinism is however disavowed by some earnest communities which hold its type of doctrine; because they find or think they find in Scripture the principles on which Predestinarianism rests. They boldly assume that the teaching of the Word of God is on this subject, as on some others, expressed in opposite and seemingly contradictory terms, which it is not within the range of man's faculties to reconcile. The antinomy, or paradox, of a determinate decree of election combined with the most universal appeals to human free will, they regard as the final word of the Bible; and, admitting that the earliest Christians were unconscious of it, they claim for Augustine the distinction of having given it the prominence in his teaching which the Scripture assigns to it. This is therefore matter of pure exegesis, and the question remains—though it is no question to us—whether or not God has imposed this heavy burden on the human intellect and on Christian faith. Meanwhile what is unreasonably called Arminianism is the faith of the Eastern and Western Churches representing

Ancient Christianity though in its corruption, of Lutheranism, representing the Reformation, of the Church of England throughout the British Empire, and of Methodism in all its branches throughout the world

27. Vol 02 - The Preliminaries of Salvation

The Preliminaries of Salvation PRELIMINARIES OF SALVATION: THE SPIRIT OF GRACE Grace Prevenient Scriptural Doctrine

Importance

FREE WILL RELATION OF GRACE TO FREEDOM OF WILL CONVERSION, REPENTANCE, FAITH, CONVERSION The Term Connection with Preliminary Grace Relation to Repentance and Faith REPENTANCE AND FAITH

Repentance Divinely wrought Conviction

Human in Contrition Submission to the Law and Confession

Reparation Legal and Evangelical FAITH, DIVINE AND HUMAN

Belief

Saving Faith Trust Passive and Active by the Holy Spirit Assurance Relations of Repentance and Faith The work of the Holy Spirit must now be viewed as preparing the soul for admission into the consummate blessings of the covenant of grace: a work which He accomplishes, not absolutely as He imparts those blessings themselves, but as quickening, aiding and directing the energies of the free will of man to seek them. The preparation, when viewed in relation to His agency, is Preliminary Grace; in respect to man, it tends to secure compliance with the conditions of the covenant. In all sound doctrine on this subject there must be a certain combination of the Divine element and the human. The result is seen in Conversion, Repentance, and Faith, in their unity, distinctness, and mutual relations, all which belong to the sphere of the Spirit’s prevenient influence The Holy Ghost is here the Author of preliminary grace: that is, of the kind of preparatory influence which is imparted outside of the temple of Christ’s mystical body, or rather in the outer court of that temple. When He bestows the full blessings of personal salvation, as they are the result of a union with Christ, He is simply and solely the Administrator and Giver: the object of this grace in the nature of things can only receive

Forgiveness, adoption, sanctification are necessarily Divine acts: nothing can be more absolute than the prerogative of God in conferring these blessings. This does not imply that the influences which prepare the soul for these acts of perfect grace are not from a Divine source alone. It must be remembered that it is the Grace of the Lord Jesus Christ1 flowing from, and revealing the Love of God that is dispensed even to the outer world in the Communion of the Holy Ghost. But it must also be remembered that this prevenient influence is literally bound up with the human use of it being without meaning apart from that use; and, moreover, that of itself it is not saving, though it is unto salvation. The present department of theology is beset with peculiar difficulties, and has been the arena of some of the keenest controversies. Hence, it will be important to establish our points by the evidence of Scripture; and, only after this is done, turn aside to the polemics of the question 1 2 Corinthians 13:14 THE SPIRIT OF GRACE The Spirit of Grace is the Author of every

movement of man's soul towards salvation; but His influence requires and indeed implies a certain co-operation of man as its object

Here then we have three topics to be considered: grace prevenient, human co-operating agency, and the relation between grace and free will GRACE PREVENIENT The Grace of God which bringeth salvation is the fountain of Divine loving kindness to mankind, undeserving and impotent; exhibited once for all in the redeeming mission of Christ; and exercised in the administration of the Holy Ghost, THE SPIRIT OF GRACE, throughout the whole range of His saving work. It is the sole, efficient cause of all spiritual good in man: of the beginning, continuance, and consummation of religion in the human soul. The manifestation of Divine influence which precedes the full regenerate life receives no special name in Scripture; but it is so described as to warrant the designation usually given it of Prevenient Grace

I. GRACE, charis, is the love of the Triune God as it is displayed towards sinful man, helpless in his sin. It is therefore free grace corresponding to universal love; mercy towards the guilty and help for the impotent soul. It is sovereign as being under no compulsion, even that of the Atonement, which it provided, and was not created by it. It is universal, being spoken of rather as an attribute than as an act of God; but it is particular also, suiting its manifestation to each. It is independent of merit in the object, of necessity, for otherwise grace would be no more grace; but it is not arbitrary, nor is it independent of conditions. As this grace is that of the Father and the Son in the redemption of mankind, it has already been considered. It is now viewed as the grace of the Spirit in the administration of redemption. The Holy Ghost is once in Scripture termed in a most affecting connection THE SPIRIT OF GRACE.1 The propriety of the term Prevenient Grace, and the doctrine which it signifies, rests upon the general truth that salvation is altogether of the Divine loving-kindness. This is declared in two ways: man is impotent in his guilt and weakness; God's manifold gift in redemption is free

1 Hebrews 10:29

1. The powerlessness of man is everywhere assumed in Scripture, though not stated often in positive terms. Like many other universal truths—such as the Being of God, the immortality of the soul—it is the presupposition of the whole Bible. Still, it has sound and most impressive Scriptural confirmations: though some of those which may be appealed to must, in exegetical fidelity, be cautiously received. Certain of these passages refer rather to the hardening effect of continued sin: such as you hath He quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins.1 Some describe the impotence of man to carry on of himself God's work; such as Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts,2 and Not that we are sufficient of ourselves, to count aught as from ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God.3 Not a few refer to the entire dependence of the believer on Christ for all his spiritual good; such as Without Me ye can do nothing.4 But there are others which lay stress upon the fact that the world was lost in sin and weakness when Christ interposed: When we were yet without strength (asthenoon, helpless), in due time Christ died for the ungodly (aseboon, godless). While we were yet sinners (hamartooloón, transgressors), Christ died for us. When we were enemies (echthroí, under wrath), we were reconciled to God.5 Now all these words, while they depict the estate of fallen man at the time when the Redeemer appeared, must be made general in their application. They give, as a quaternion, the best negative definition of grace that the Scripture furnishes. As sinners are under the law and guilty, grace finds a method

of mercy; as they are under the Divine displeasure, it provides for the reconciliation of God; as they are cut off from fellowship with their Maker, it gives them the Spirit of worship and holiness; as they are absolutely unable to help themselves, it provides them all the help of Heaven. . Man is unequal to his own salvation, however it is viewed: whether in its beginning, or in its process, or in its end 1 Ephesians 2:1; 2 Zechariah 4:6; 3 2 Corinthians 3:5; 4 John 15:5; 5 Romans 5:6; Romans 5:8; Romans 5:10

2. Hence it is declared that the salvation of man is altogether of grace. By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God:1 altogether of grace and not of works. There is no need to ask to which—whether salvation or faith— the GIFT refers: it refers to both, which in this connection are inseparable. It is not so much in single passages as in the constant tenor of Scripture that we gather the spontaneous freedom of the grace that provided salvation. In fact, the origin of human redemption is always traced to the love of God which, resting upon undeserving man, became grace And the use of the term in the New Testament illustrates this. The word, as sanctified to Christian uses, and apart from its occasional classical application as graciousness, —in which sense it lights upon our Lord's lips: they wondered at the gracious words, tees charitos, which proceeded out of His mouth,2—has three meanings in the New Testament. It is Grace from God to man, and as such is the sum of benediction:3 charis umin; it is Grace working within the soul:4 My grace, hee charis mou, is sufficient for thee; and, finally, it is Grace going back to God in thanks:5 Charis too Theoo, thanks be to God 1 Ephesians 2:8; 2 Luke 4:22; 3 2 Corinthians 1:2; 4 2 Corinthians 12:9; 5 2 Corinthians 9:15

II. This grace as the influence of the Spirit on the minds of men generally and of individual men before their personal acceptance is described in various ways. These may be classed as, first, referring to the Divine operation, when it is a striving and drawing; secondly, in relation to the means used, when it is a demonstration of the truth; thirdly, as influencing man, when it is the working in him to will, by piercing or opening his heart

These three are distinct, but one; and, when compared, yield a doctrine which is simple in its mystery though mysterious in its simplicity

1. The drawing and striving of the Spirit are throughout the Scriptures abundantly referred to: the former operating on the human soul regarded as obedient; the latter wrestling with that soul regarded as repugnant; both tending to salvation, and in every case rendering that salvation possible. The Old-Testament declaration, My Spirit shall not always strive withMan 1:1 may be capable of another interpretation, but it is followed by constant reference to a resisting of the Spirit as the secret of human impenitence. In the New Testament we hear, from the lips of the Great Attraction Himself: No man can come to Me except the Father Which hath sent Me draw him,2 and we may add, This spake He of the Spirit.3 Both the striving and the drawing express the strongest influence short of compulsion. The zeal of human agency, described in Scripture, catches the same tone and strictly corresponds, being its representative. That I might by all means save some4 and Compel them to come in5 are mutually correlative: neither the command, nor the obedience to it, is consistent with an absence of Divine influence, or with anything but a Divine purpose to save 1 Genesis 6:3; 2 John 6:44; 3 John 7:39; 4 1 Corinthians 9:22; 5 Luke 14:23

2. The Word of Truth is never without the influence of the Spirit. On the Day of Pentecost the first Christian sermon was preached with His accompanying power: they spoke, first indeed only to

God but afterwards to man, as the Spirit gave them utterance.1 Nothing less than this is meant by the reference to the Word of God which effectually worketh2 in those that believe, and to the Gospel which came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost.3 An effectual Divine energy is described as belonging to the Word preached, apart from its final result: My preaching was . . . in demonstration of the Spirit and of power.4 This apodeixei is opposed to the influence of rhetorical skill, and establishes the general fact that the Spirit's power has the energy and effect of a Divine persuasion, whether yielded to or not 1 Acts 2:4; 2 1 Thessalonians 2:13; 3 1 Thessalonians 1:5; 4 1 Corinthians 2:4

3. The effect produced is occasionally made prominent. Under that first sermon they were pricked in their heart,1 which in another form is stated of Lydia, whose heart the Lord opened.2 The piercing and the opening are not in these texts so different as is sometimes thought: both the Jews and Lydia attended unto the things which were spoken as the result. It is God which, of His good pleasure, worketh in you to will and to do:3 here we have the last word of Scripture on this subject 1 Acts 2:37; 2 Acts 16:14; 3 Php 2:13 PERSONAL HUMAN AGENCY:FREE WILL The prevenient grace of the Spirit is exercised on the natural man: that is, on man as the Fall has left him. As the object of that grace man is a personality free and responsible, by the evidence of consciousness and conscience. As fallen he is throughout all his faculties enslaved to sin; but knows that sin is foreign to his original nature, and that the slavery is not hopeless nor of necessity. His will is still the originating power or principle of selfdetermination, under the influence of motives originated in the understanding and feeling, but capable of controlling those motives. And his whole nature, as fallen, whether regarded as intellect, sensibility or will, is under some measure of the influence of the Holy Spirit, the firstfruits of the gift of redemption

These several propositions are in themselves clear and simple and true. They are in harmony with all sound psychology; with common sense; and with the tenor and tendency of all Scripture. Their difficulty is felt only in relation to the theological speculations which have been connected with the influence of the Holy Spirit, and the metaphysical speculations with which the doctrine of election has surrounded them

1. Prevenient grace is exercised on the personality of man, free and accountable: not upon any particular element of his nature, but upon himself. That personality is the Suppositum Intelligens, the responsible author of all that he does: not his will, nor his feeling, nor his intellect; but the hidden man, the autos ego, the central substantial person who is behind and beneath all his affections and attributes. That influence of the Spirit, directly or through the Word, is exercised upon the agent whom St. Paul describes as the active I or the passive Me of every religious feeling that precedes regeneration

2. The person or personality of the natural or unregenerate man is free, inasmuch as no power from without controls his will. It is the very nature of will to originate volition: otherwise, if constrained, will is no more will; the possessor of it is not accountable; and volition is only a misnomer for the obedience, only in appearance spontaneous, to a natural or physical law. Consciousness and conscience alike attest that the sinner—for of the sinner we are now speaking—is free and responsible: his consciousness in its first elements is that of a free agent; and his conscience, or MORAL CONSCIOUSNESS, asserts his responsibility, not only for actions but for words and thoughts and the whole posture of the mind

3. Again, that person is bound and enslaved to sin. Naturally the bias to evil and the aversion from the moral law are so universal that, even apart from New-Testament teaching, common consent allows that human nature is bound to what is wrong: so bound that none can escape without a direct Divine intervention; and bound so universally in actual experience as to warrant the induction that none will ever be born without it. In the case of actual transgressors, the effect of habit invariably both proves the original innate bondage and deepens its strength

4. But the slavery is not absolute. It is conscious slavery, and not submitted to without reluctance. It is not so much a fetter on the will itself, as the ascendancy of a sinful bias over the motives that actuate the conduct by governing the will: the feelings and desires of the affection, and the thoughts of the mind. The will is not bound; but the understanding which guides it is darkened, and the affection which prompts its exercise is corrupted by sense. Now here comes in the doctrine of Prevenient Grace. It is not needed to restore to the faculty of will its power of originating action: that has never been lost But it is needed to suggest to the intellect the truth on which religion rests, and to sway the affections of hope and fear by enlisting the heart on the side of that truth THE RELATION OF GRACE TO THE FREEDOM OF THE WILL The Grace of God and the human will are co-operant, but not on equal terms. Grace has the pre-eminence, and that for many reasons. First, the universal influence of the Spirit is the true secret of man's capacity for religion; secondly, His influence, connected with the Word, is universal, inevitable, and irresistible, as claiming the consideration of the natural man; and, lastly, He gives the power, whether used or not, to decide against sin and submit to God. These facts assure to grace its supremacy in all that belongs to salvation But the co-operation of the will is real: because in this last stage it rests with the free agent himself whether the influence of the Spirit be repelled or yielded to. This is the uniform and unfailing testimony of Scripture; the consideration of which will prepare the way for a brief review of ecclesiastical opinions and dogmas on the subject

I. The general truth of a co-operation between the Spirit and the will of man is a postulate of the entire Scripture. Like some other fundamental truths, it is not demonstrated but taken for granted; and that very fact is sufficient evidence of our proposition. This cooperation may be viewed negatively or positively

1. Negatively, there is no reference in the only authority to an arbitrary Divine power reigning over the things that accompany salvation. He who works in us to will is never represented as working so absolutely upon us that nothing is left to personal responsibility. Turn Thou me! is followed by the I shall be turned!1 And both parts of the sentence must have their force. There is no saying in the Word of God which, fairly expounded, represents the Divine Spirit as overruling the energy of the human object of His grace 1 Jeremiah 31:18

2. Positively, and in the most express manner, the Scripture represents Divine prevenient grace as operating through and with man's free concurrence. Figuratively this is expressed by the good ground1 which receives the seed: everywhere it is assumed that the first application of truth is probationary, detecting a character in the hearer which in some sense decides all But it must always be remembered that this hearer of the Word has a preliminary grace in the roots of his nature which he yields to or resists in the very act of resisting or yielding to the appeal of Heaven. We find it, literally, in all those passages which declare that believers themselves voluntarily receive the Word of God or of Christ or of grace. So, in the Thessalonians Having received the

word2 (dexamenoi answering to parelabete). This last expression is used concerning the reception of Christ: As ye have received Christ Jesus the Lord.3 Another and cardinal text is: We then, as workers together with Him, beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain.4 Here there is a co-operation of the Apostles with God; but it is equally certain that there is a co-operation of believers with both 1 Matthew 13:23; 2 1 Thessalonians 1:6; 2:13; 3 Colossians 2:6; 4 2 Corinthians 6:1 II. That the Spirit has the pre-eminence is equally the doctrine of all the Scripture, as indeed it is of common sense

1. The fact that man is, since the Fall, still a free agent is not more essentially a necessity of his moral nature than it is the effect of grace. Redemption is universal, and goes back to the root of the nature. Its universality has this for its result that all who are born into the world are born into a state of probation: otherwise the human spirit would have fallen back under the law of physical necessity, or into that of diabolic bondage to evil

Unredeemed spirits are responsible; but their responsibility is no longer probationary: they are responsible for a state of guilt that has become determined by their own first act become habitual. The difference put between them and us is the mystery of redeeming mercy. The children of men are in bondage to sin; this is the character which is stamped upon them by inheritance. But the bondage is not hopeless nor is it to any mortal necessary; they have a natural capacity of freedom to act as well as to choose, to perform as well as will; and this their very nature is itself grace

2. Grace has the pre-eminence inasmuch as its influence when the Word is preached, whether directly or indirectly, is inevitable and irresistible. Prevenient grace moves upon the will through the affections of fear and hope; and these affections are necessarily moved by the truths which the understanding perceives. But the understanding is under the necessary influence of the Word, while, apart from the understanding, in some sense, the passions are under the control of the Spirit. However obstinately and effectually the truth may be resisted as a ruling power, as truth it cannot be resisted

3. Moreover, in the secret recesses of man’s nature the grace is given disposing and enabling him to yield. Though the will must at last act from its own resources and deliberate impulse, it is influenced through the feeling and the understanding in such a manner as to give it strength. It is utterly hopeless to penetrate this mystery: it is the secret between God’s Spirit and man’s agency. There is a Divine operation which works the desire and acts in such a manner as not to interfere with the natural freedom of the will. The man determines himself, through Divine grace, to salvation: never so free as when swayed by grace CONVERSION, REPENTANCE, FAITH

Conversion is the process by which the soul turns, or is turned, from sin to God, in order to its acceptance through faith in Christ. This is its strict meaning, as distinguished from that broader sense in which it is applied to the entire history of the soul’s restoration. As the turning away from sin it is closely allied to Repentance, though not synonymous with it; as the turning to God it includes or is merged in Faith

CONVERSION

I. The term Conversion stands here for a few equivalents in Hebrew and Greek which express the same religious idea; that of the change by which the soul is turned from sin to God. The fact that it is thus common to the two Testaments gives it a great importance. It is the general description of

the restoration of the sinner that runs through the Bible; and therefore has been very often regarded as including much more than the mere crisis of moral and religious change. Sometimes it is thought to represent the whole course, through all its stages, of the return of the soul to God: this is the case especially in the works of mystical writers, and of some who are not mystical. By those, for instance, who recognize no saving influence before regeneration, out of which repentance and faith flow, conversion is of necessity made to include all the moral blessings of the state of grace: in fact, it must have a very indeterminate meaning in every system of Calvinism The theology that may be called Sacramentarian generally regards conversion as the process of recovery from a state in which the regenerating grace conferred in baptism has been neglected and might seem to be lost. Sometimes, by a very loose employment of the term, it is made synonymous with the experience of forgiveness and the assurance of the reconciliation. But we must remember that it simply means the turning point of the religious life: its turning from a course of sin to the commencement of seeking God

Hence the crisis that it marks is not in the religious life of a 'believer, but in the life of the soul, redeemed indeed, but not yet a new creature in Christ

II. Conversion belongs, therefore, only to the outer court of the Christian temple. Two considerations will further illustrate this

1. In conversion the Divine and the human agency combine: It may be said that they cooperate, if the word be rightly understood. This is not the case in the inner court of the state of salvation by grace. The blessings proper to the Christian covenant are imparted: the believer simply receives his justification, his adoption and regeneration, his sanctification. But his conversion is the preparation for these absolute gifts of redemption: the new life of righteousness, sonship, and holiness is the one supreme conclusive benefit of the Christian covenant grace, and man must be made fit to receive it. The process of this preparation is his conversion to God. When that process is accomplished the conversion is ended: Ye were as sheep going astray; but are now RETURNED unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls.1 Now throughout this preliminary stage of the religious life the grace of the Spirit and the effort of man unite. (1.) The appeal to God to convert the soul runs through the Bible: such Old-Testament prayers as Turn Thou me, and I shall be turned; for Thou art the Lord my God,2 and Turn Thou us unto Thee, 0 Lord, and we shall be turned; renew our days as of old,3 express the spirit of the New Testament also, though not found in its letter. (2.) But the appeal from God to man to turn himself is yet more abundant: Turn ye, turn ye, from your evil ways, for why will ye die, 0 house of Israel?4 where the whole strain is without meaning if converting grace is irresistible. Here the New Testament affords abundant support: Ye will not come unto Me, that ye might have life.5 Hence, when treating of Repentance and Faith, the two elements of conversion, we have continually to exhibit, as will be seen, a Divine commandment with promise. The grace is from the Lord; the use of it is with man himself 1 1 Peter 2:25; 2 Jeremiah 31:18; 3 Lamentations 5:21; 4 Ezekiel 33:11; 5 John 5:40

2. The New Testament expressly limits the term Conversion to the beginning or introduction of the Christian life. There is no instance of its use in reference to the changes in the believer's state as such. But here a distinction must be made. It is true that the word is constantly employed to mark the recovery of those who were backsliders from the preparatory grace of the old covenant. In fact, this is its habitual signification throughout the Old Testament: the appeals to return to Jehovah are

addressed to those who had departed from a God already known and forsaken. The same holds good of our Lord's use of the word when He quotes Isaiah: lest they should be converted, and I should heal them;1 as also of the prophecy of His forerunner's agency: many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God.2 Simon Peter's conversion, after which he should strengthen his brethren, was a return from backsliding. But after the day of Pentecost the word begins to be used more broadly, of the turning from darkness to light3 generally. St. James gives the solitary instance of its employment to note a Christian's recovery from the error of his way;4 but that error was no less than a full departure from the truth of the Gospel Generally, conversion is supposed to be accomplished when the Christian faith is received. From that time the penitent is a convert: his conversion is an accomplished fact 1 Matthew 13:15; 2 Luke 1:16; 3 Acts 36:18; 4 James 5:20 III. It remains to consider the relation of Conversion to Repentance and Faith, as distinct from and yet including each

1. Sometimes the term seems to embrace both in the unity of preparation for the common evangelical benefit. The blessing of Jesus is the turning away everyone of you from his iniquities; or from darkness to light;1 or from idols to serve the living and true God2 Here the negative and the positive are united in the description of the conversion whether of Jews or of Gentiles 1 Acts 3:26; 2 Acts 26:18

2. Sometimes it is more particularly the negative repentance: the aversion of the soul from sin through a conviction of its true character; a sorrowing hatred of it as estrangement from God, and abandonment of it in the sincere purpose of the convinced spirit. Repent ye therefore and be converted:1 here the forgiveness is supposed afterwards to follow, and conversion is limited to the effect of repentance. But repentance is also exhibited as the effect of conversion: Surely after that I was turned, I repented.2 Again the conversion is itself repentance: he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death.3 These are all instances of a certain freedom of Scripture in the use of these terms which should warn us against over-careful dogmatic distinctions 1 Acts 3:19; 2 Jeremiah 31:19; 3 James 5:20

3. More frequently conversion is made equivalent to faith. A great number believed and turned unto the Lord:1 where faith has the same relation to the turning which repentance has in the previous passages. Sometimes faith is omitted where it is nevertheless meant: And all that dwelt at Lydda and Saron saw him, and turned to the Lord.2 It is even made the distinguishing element in conversion: but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls.3 1 Acts 11:21; 2 Acts 9:35; 3 1 Peter 2:25

4. Thus it is observable that conversion is more closely than repentance and faith connected with the means or circumstances that bring about the crisis. These circumstances may be very various, and the concomitants may also vary. The same result was produced by the terrors through which the jailer was converted,1 and the gentle influence which turned the heart of Lydia. And, in the ordinary application of the Gospel, these are typical instances: there may be sudden or instantaneous conversion, and there may be gentle and gradual conversion

1 Acts 16:1-40

5. Hence, finally, as both repentance and faith enter into the Christian life, continue in it, and in it are made perfect, there is a sense in which Conversion, of which repentance and faith are the two

elements, also runs on into the state of grace. This brings us back to the point from which we set out: that there is a wider meaning of the term which must not be forgotten while the stricter is adhered to. So far as the old man remains in the regenerate there must be a perpetual turning away from the sins of the past and advancement towards holiness: whether that holiness be separation from sin in a perpetual conversion, or union with God in a never-ceasing faith. In other words, there is an ethical conversion that goes on until the soul is entirely dead to sin and one with God. But in the Order of Grace Conversion is the process of the soul's first coming to Christ, and it would be well on the whole to restrict its use to that meaning REPENTANCE AND FAITH As the conditions of that salvation which is the personal possession of the common heritage, Repentance towards God and Faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ are always united in the New Testament. They cannot be separated, as repentance implies preexisting faith, and faith implies pre-existing repentance. But they differ in this, that faith is the instrument as well as a condition of individual acceptance; and, as such, springs out of and follows repentance. Both are produced by the preliminary grace of the Holy Spirit, but not perfected without the concurrence of the will of man. Though both are only introductory to the state of grace, properly so called, faith in its saving exercise is the transition point where the state of conviction passes into life in Christ

REPENTANCE

Repentance is a Divinely-wrought conviction of sin, the result of the Holy Spirit's application of the condemning law to the conscience or heart. It approves itself in contrition, which distinguishes it from the mere knowledge of sin; in submission to the judicial sentence, which is the essence of true confession; and in sincere effort to amend, which desires to make reparation to the dishonored law. Hence it must needs come from God and go back to Him: the Holy Spirit, using the law, being the Agent in producing this preliminary Divine change

Repentance, or conviction of sin with its effects, is here regarded prominently as the result of the spiritual revelation of the Divine law to the conscience of the sinner. But it must not be forgotten that the same repentance may be regarded without this direct and express reference to law: it is the sense of ingratitude which the prodigal feels when returning to his Father; and, of utter defilement which the unholy soul feels in the presence of the Divine purity. Even then, however, the fundamental thought is the broken commandment I. Repentance is the effect of a Divinely-wrought application of the holy law

1. It is generally said to be the gift of God. In the words of the early Church, receiving the first tidings of the vocation of the heathen, then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life,1 we must understand not only, first, that the opportunity of repentance was proclaimed, and, secondly, the promises to repentance set forth, but, thirdly, the actual power of repenting also afforded. Similarly in that first full statement of the Gospel: Him hath God exalted with His right hand to be a Prince and a Savior, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins.2 But it needs no express testimony to prove that every right feeling concerning self and concerning God's law must come from on high: every good gift and every perfect gift is from above,3 and this includes all spiritual influences. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit;4 they are the sacrifices OF GOD: of these also it may be said, I have given it to you upon the altar, though NOT to make atonement for your souls.5 1 Acts 11:18; 2 Acts 5:31; 3 James 1:17; 4 Psalms 51:17; 5 Leviticus 17:11

2. More particularly it is the office of the Spirit of conviction, Whom the Savior promised to send to reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment.1 This conviction of the Spirit, in its threefold character, is the essence of evangelical repentance as preached under the Gospel: repentance following the application of the law—for there is no other repentance preliminary to grace—but in its peculiar relation to Christ. And the Spirit Himself is indirectly called in this office, the Spirit of bondage.2 1 John 16:8; 2 Romans 8:15

II. The human evidences of repentance are both its fruits and its tests. They are so described in Scripture as to show that the Divine operation is wrought through the human faculties, and finds human expression as if it were the act of man himself. They constitute his threefold recognition of the majesty of the law to the existence and claims of which he is now awakened

1. CONTRITION or sorrow for sin is expressed in many ways: especially in the Old Testament, the descriptions of which have no parallel out of themselves, none even in the New Testament. (1.) It is a broken and a contrite heart;1 the heart being the inmost personality and not the sensibilities only, nor the judgment only, nor only the will. The word has its Hebrew meaning; corresponding with the broken spirit which precedes: this last being the perfect watchword of that true repentance to which, as running through the life, the promise is given: Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.2 The hidden man mourns before God: his mind meditating on the sinfulness of his sin, his feeling oppressed with grief, and his will absolutely turned against it. Hence (2.) it is godly sorrow,3 hee kata lupee, and not the sorrow of the world, which dreads the consequences of transgression rather than hates the transgression itself. It is mourning that proves its genuineness by refusing to be comforted save by Divine mercy: it is not so much godly—this is regenerate repentance—as towards God. (3.) It is a keen sense of sin universal, and not of particular sins. The conviction of its sinfulness is a new and peculiar experience: a new moral consciousness which makes perfect the conscience of sin. By the law, applied by the Spirit, is the knowledge of sin.4 But our Lord tells us that the world is to be convinced of sin because they believe not on Me:5 Christ the Savior is Himself the best and only revelation of the evil from which He saves 1 Psalms 51:17; 2 Matthew 5:3; 3 2 Corinthians 7:10; 4 Romans 3:20; 5 John 16:9

2. Submission to the condemning law is of the essence of true repentance and takes the form of CONFESSION. This may be regarded in two lights: it is the utterance of utter hopelessness, and of a profound sense of the justice of God in the visitation of iniquity But the latter takes precedence.

(1.) The law pronounces condemnation, the terrors of which are now first felt; and the sinner, even though in the presence of Christ, Who preaches repentance, and all the more because he is in the presence of Christ, accepts the utmost rigor of judgment as just. He sees his guilt, and sees his inexpressible pollution, in the light of the Divine countenance, and abhors himself, while he fears his Judge.

(2.) The law convicts of impotence: and so the penitent cries, When the commandment came, sin revived, and I died.1 True repentance absolutely withers all hope in self as to present or future ability.

(3.) These are united in CONFESSION, which is especially in this preliminary stage only to Heaven. True repentance comes from God and returns back to Him Who gave it. There is a

confession one to another2 commended by the Apostle James, which belongs rather to the Christian life and is consistent with confession of universal sin to God alone 1 Romans 7:9; 2 James 5:16

3. The repentance which is a condition of salvation approves its genuineness by endeavors to amend the life: negatively by turning from sin; positively by aiming at obedience. This effort is imposed on every penitent by the command of Scripture: Cease to do evil, learn to do well.1 Bring forth therefore fruit worthy of repentance2 is the New- Testament formula. The Baptist, the representative preacher of repentance, gives the solitary instance of these fruits of a tree neither corrupt nor as yet sound. They are not the acts of a regenerate life; for the promise of the Holy Ghost is held out as a future gift

They are not fruits of a corrupt tree; for the Spirit gives the prevenient grace that enables the penitent to present them to God. They are tokens of sincerity, and are essential as such; for the Scripture invariably demands obedience to God's law, and reparation of every injury to man; not indeed as securing forgiveness, but as its peremptory condition

Both are expressed by the two New-Testament terms, metamellomai or metanoein: the latter a change of mind, the former a change of purpose. In this turning from sin and turning towards holiness, the act is rather dwelt upon than the feeling. The feeling may vary, as it regards both the sense of sin and the sense of condemnation; it may have endless varieties of expression, but the act is always the same 1 Isaiah 1:16-17; 2 Matthew 3:8

III. Repentance, thus described, is still in the outer court. It belongs to the midway state between nature and grace; but has, nevertheless, a special relation to the dispensation of law. This may be finally illustrated by a summary view of the New-Testament method of enforcing its necessity and its requirements

1. John the Baptist is the pre-eminent preacher of repentance. The forerunner of Christ, he is also the forerunner of His Gospel. His doctrine contains every principle necessary to its perfection; and his ministry, not less than that of the Apostles, was in power, and in the Holy Ghost.1 He preached repentance as universally necessary and available. Repent ye!2 was his one word to all alike. He enforced it as incumbent on every man at the present moment: on the one hand, because the axe is laid unto the root; and, on the other, because the kingdom of heaven was at hand. He required it to be thorough, profound, and perfect: Prepare ye the way of the Lord! Every valley shall be filled, and every mountain and hill shall be brought low. He proclaimed it as accompanied by its meet fruits of reformation, restitution, and pledges of amendment: Bring forth therefore fruit worthy of repentance. And, finally, he preached it as preparatory to the salvation of Christ and the baptism of the Holy Ghost. All flesh shall see the salvation of God. But the one supreme theme of his enforcement is the necessity of repentance as the preparation for Christ 1 1 Thessalonians 1:5; 2 Luke 3:3-16

2. Further illustrations of this are found in the Gospels. The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force:1 words which, whatever other meaning they bear, have evident reference to John's baptism, and the desperate discipline of preparatory repentance. The blind man at Bethsaida, whom the Savior exhibited in a state of intermediate and halting cure— no longer wholly blind, but more miserable than when he was; not yet fully enlightened, but on the

way to it—illustrates the prevenient grace of repentance. This solitary instance of our Lord's suspended power has a meaning for all ages. There is a first touch, the effect of which is:

I see men, as trees, walking.2 There is a second, when he was restored and saw every man dearly. Teaching other lessons as to the progression of grace, and its critical stages, this unique miracle teaches also that repentance is the transition to the mercy of the Gospel. The Baptist's relicts an; found in the Acts: Apollos required only to be taught the way of God more perfectly;3 and the Ephesian Twelve were prepared for the full Christian baptism which they had long waited for. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on Him that should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus.4 1 Matthew 11:12; 2 Mark 13:24-25; 3 Acts 18:24-27; 4 Acts 19:1-7

3. Hence, finally, while the evangelical element is not wanting in this repentance—it has a presentiment of the Gospel—it is yet under the law. All that has been said may be summed up thus. The Holy Spirit of conviction applies the law to the conscience, and thus works His reproof. The effect is sorrow before God as the Lawgiver rather than as the Father, or before the Father as the Fountain of moral authority; acceptance of the righteous sentence pronounced upon transgression; and sincere though imperfect, necessary though not meritorious, endeavors to make reparation to the dishonored majesty of right. Beyond this the repentance which is the condition of salvation does not go. But it does not fall short of this: it is in all its processes the soul's tribute to the law from the condemnation of which the Gospel, received in faith, can alone save the transgressor

FAITH

Faith as the instrument of appropriating salvation is a Divinely-wrought belief in the record concerning Christ and trust in His Person as a personal Savior: these two being one. It must be distinguished, on the one hand, from the general exercise of belief following evidence which is one of the primary elements of human nature, and from the grace of faith which is one of the fruits of the regenerating Spirit. As Divinely wrought, it is attended by assurance; as human, it works by love. And thus, while belonging to the state of prevenient grace, it passes insensibly into the regenerate life

Faith, viewed here more comprehensively as the condition and instrument of personal salvation, is a state or an act of the human spirit as under the influence of the Divine Spirit. The Divine and the human elements meet, but they cannot be so clearly defined and separated as in the case of repentance. We must view them as united in relation to the principle of belief, generally, on which saving faith rests; to the passive and active trust that enter into that faith; and to the assurance of acceptance and salvation which follow it in the regenerate life

I. BELIEF, or the principle of faith generally, belongs to human nature: it is the faculty of accepting the unseen as existing, by which we admit as knowledge what is received only on evidence or authority internal or external. Now this common faculty of faith, which involves trust in what we believe, is Divinely directed to the Gospel in order to personal salvation

1. Man lives and moves and has his being, as a spiritual creature, in an element of belief or trust in the unseen; in that sense also we walk by faith, not by sight.1 Belief is a primary condition of all knowledge and of all reasoning on knowledge. It may be said that without it there can be no full

assent given to any proposition that deals with other than matter of sense. Hence the propriety of Anselm's CREDE UT INTELLIGAS, in opposition to Abelard's INTELLIGE UT CREDAS; the two watchwords of Christian Faith and Rationalism respectively. Now all faith that leads to action has in it an element of trust. The being of God, the guilt and punishment of sin, the mission of Christ for redemption, the Christian revelation as a whole, may be assented to by intellectual belief without exerting any influence on the life. But this kind of belief is not, as alone, commended in Scripture

Faith is there always connected with the practical trust which makes these truths more or less operative. The object of this faith, not yet a personal Savior, may be generally apprehended: the compass of the Christian Faith is often accepted without the experience of salvation. To whatever extent the truths of religion are known and embraced, faith in them is the healthy and legitimate exercise of the human mind, receiving the evidence, internal and external, which authenticates revelation. But that faith cannot be without the element of trust, latent it may be and unconscious, suppressed by sin and hindered from the attainment of its end 1 2 Corinthians 5:7

2. This belief or trust of which we speak is exerted under a Divine influence. A merely intellectual assent, such as rests upon tradition and education, is not enough for salvation: The devils also believe, and tremble.1 Seldom does this belief withstand the assault of skeptical attack. Never does the trust inherent in it become influential. No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.2 A firm belief in the Christian revelation, and trust in Him Whom it reveals as God and man, is the very precious gift of the Spirit, Who acts upon the elements of belief and trust in human nature, and directs them to their appropriate Object. Belief is often made perfect in the exercise of personal trust; and personal trust often leads to the strengthening of mere belief. Sometimes the clear revelation of the truth in Jesus to the mind leads to an entire reliance on His work; and sometimes the personal trust with its confidence of faith brings in the full assurance of understanding as to the outward revelation: speculative or historical faith thus, through Divine grace, deepens into that spiritual faith, which in its last exercise is the gift of God to the soul by Himself prepared for its exercise 1 James 2:19; 2 1 Corinthians 12:3

II. The Faith that is the condition and instrument of salvation may be regarded as fiducial belief in the Redeemer, Whose Person and Work are one as a revelation of God, and of all saving truth. This trust is both negative and positive, or passive and active: it renounces every other object, and relies only on One. It is the act of the whole man, but under the immediate influence of the Holy Ghost

1. The formal notion of all Faith, and that which makes it the appropriate condition of salvation, is personal trust in a Person. Its efficient cause is the operation of the Spirit on the human faculties; its instrumental cause is the revelation of the truth concerning the Savior; and its formal cause, which makes it what it is, is trust in the Person of that Savior

(1.) This important truth is taught by the very term that is everywhere used in the New Testament: pisteuein is equivalent to pistin echeinbe'amuwnaatow; the equivalent of the Hebrew be'amuwnaatow, which in almost every instance of its use includes the idea of reliance on the Jehovah of the Ancient Covenant

(2.) It is also seen in the fact that this principle is almost always connected, directly or indirectly, with a Person, and that even when the acceptance of Christian truth by the understanding is made

prominent. First, the ground of faith is the authority of God Who is believed: Abraám epísteusen toó Theoó, Abraham believed God,1 and accordingly trusted in Him. Throughout his history, as that of the Father of the faithful and their exemplar, we find nothing required or imposed on his belief as truth which did not demand the unlimited trust of his heart in God: indeed, in some cases it might be hard to accept as credible to the understanding what nevertheless was acted upon in desperate confidence. In the New Testament the Savior speaks of a credence in His words; on His own authority: Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me; for he wrote of Me But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe My words?2 Here Jesus is arguing with unbelievers, and the matter is one of belief on authority. But, most commonly, He uses the word concerning trust in Himself; though, in this case, the word is varied and a large variety of synonymous expressions is used, such as coming to Him and seeing Him and surrendering self to Him. Hence, secondly, a Person is the substantial Object of all saving faith, to Whom it turns, on Whom it relies, and in Whom it finds rest: according to the three currently used prepositions, eis, epi, en, of each of which it may suffice to give one example. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life:3 eis ton Huion, which is opposed to the unbeliever's simple disbelief of the word of Christ, he that believeth not the Son, apeithoon too Huioo. This passage represents many which make Christ the Object to Whom faith as it were stretches forward. Whosoever believeth on Him, ep auto, shall not be ashamed:4 a preposition used also with the accusative, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly,5 epi ton dikaiounta. Here the Person is the foundation on which faith rests. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus,6 en Christoo Ieesou. Here, as in many other passages, the Person of Christ is the Object, on Which faith indeed rests, but also in Whom as its element it lives and moves. But in this case the penitent is already saved 1 Galatians 3:6; 2 John 5:46-47; 3 John 3:36; 4 Romans 10:11; 5 Romans 4:5; 6 Galatians 3:26

(3.) This Object of trust is in Christianity directly or indirectly the Founder of our religion in His own Person: its Archeegon, or AUTHOR of the faith1 Himself. Hence the usual expression, by faith of Jesus Christ2, which indicates that He gives its specific character to the principle generally. This distinguishes Christianity as the full revelation of an object of trust which was partially hidden before. Faith in God, or Jehovah, the God of the covenant, was the condition and instrument of Old-Testament salvation; but Jehovah is the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. That God is now MANIFEST in the flesh,

3 and He says, Ye believe in God, believe also in Me.4 Of those who believe not, He says, Ye neither know Me nor My Father: if ye had known Me, ye should have known My Father also.5 And the final testimony of St. John is: Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father.6 Rejection of Christ was rejection of the ancient God. Faith in God apart from His Son is now a species of unbelief. Our Lord as the object of confidence is more specifically Himself or His Person. This is its supreme definition: believe also in Me! It is only indirectly His blood; the propitiation is in His blood, en toó autoú haímati, through faith,7 but it is He who is set forth. It is confidence in His cross, or rather in Christ crucified; that is, in His death and resurrection; as to the latter of which, however, the trust is rather referred to the Father: If we believe on Him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.8 Hence it is the LIVING CHRIST in the unity of His Person and His Work.9 The God Who delivered up Christ and raised Him is Christ Himself. The tone of the entire New Testament is to the effect that He that seeth and believeth in the Son seeth and believeth the Father. But the specific relation of the Redeemer's Person to justifying faith must be

considered hereafter

1 Hebrews 12:2; 2 Romans 3:22; 3 1 Timothy 3:16; 4 John 14:1; 5 John 8:19; 6 1 John 2:23; 7 Romans 3:25; 8 1 Corinthians 1:23; 9 Romans 4:24

2. Faith is both passive and active, in opposition, that is, to a state of undue action and to a state of indolent waiting: only by so viewing it, and combining the two, can we understand the general strain of the New Testament as to its operation in the penitent and contrite spirit

(1.) As passive or receptive it is that trust or repose of the heart on the promises given in Christ, which in the New Testament is opposed to works of every kind, and throughout the Bible to any trust but in God. Assent to a moral truth, especially such as is here supposed to be wrought in the heart by the Holy Ghost, engages in its exercise the understanding and heart and the will. Faith in its negative aspect is that of the understanding affecting the heart chiefly: the soul rests on the Savior, abstains from every act, and only waits upon His promise. Only in that posture is it ready for the salvation ready to be revealed. As limited to one branch of it, that is, justification, this element of faith is of great importance: To him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.1

1 Romans 4:5 (2.) Active faith is the assent of the understanding actuating the will more particularly

Faith goes forth as well as waits; gives as well as receives. The act is to be understood in two ways: it is the energy which gives up the soul to the Lord, and that which receives Him in return; though these are not to be separated. As many as received Him and those that believe on His name1 are synonymous. He that followeth Me2 is a definition of the believer; whose faith is a coming to Christ, and a receiving of Him, parelabete.3 His Gospel is preached eis hupakoeen pisteoos for the obedience of faith.4 Many other expressions are used which represent a saving relation to Christ as the active energy of the soul: such as its flying for refuge to the only Hope, seeking Him and laying aside every impediment, committing the soul to Him, and other similar phrases. This is the kind of faith which is exhibited throughout the Gospels 1 John 1:12; 2 John 8:12; 3 Colossians 2:6; 4 Romans 16:26

(3.) It must be remembered, however, that these two are always one. The passive waiting and the active seeking unite. The Lord is good unto them that WAIT FOR Him, to the soul that SEEKETH HIM.1 And both are undoubtedly the act of God’s Spirit in the soul; as is shown in the passage of St. Paul which speaks of our being buried and risen with Christ through the faith in the operation of God, diá teés písteoos teés energeías toú Theoú.2 1 Lamentations 3:25; 2 Colossians 2:12 3. Faith is the act of the whole man under the influence- of the Holy Spirit

(1.) It is not an assent of the understanding merely, nor a feeling merely of the sensibility, nor an act of the will, but belongs to the centre of human personality, to the heart: with the heart man believeth unto righteousness,1 Kardía gár pisteúetai. The language of the Creed is, I BELIEVE: the man himself is the believer; there is no act in which he more absolutely gathers up his whole being to act, while he goes out of himself, and appropriates Another. As passive and receptive, faith makes the whole soul empty for the reception of Jesus; as active and energetic, it puts forth all its powers to embrace Him and His salvation. Hence this principle, after conversion, still continues to characterize the regenerate soul. The Christian is a pistos; he stands in this

character, teé gár pístei hesteékate,2 and his faith, working by love, becomes the spring of his new life. The act by which he entered salvation becomes the law of his being as saved 1 Romans 10:10; 2 2 Corinthians 1:24

(2.) Such and so great being the prerogative of faith, it is obvious that no power less than Divine can inspire it. It is essentially a moral act; for unbelief is reckoned to be specific guilt: the Spirit's reproof of sin is because they believe not on Me.1 The only or the supreme sin is now rejection of Christ; and the act or state of not believing is itself condemnation: he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.2 But if the faith that saves has this moral character it must be wrought in the soul by God the Holy Ghost: there is nothing right in man towards God that comes not from His influence; and the primary feeling after a Savior, as well as the trust into which this is elevated, is of Him. Hence our faith is said to be of the operation of God.3 How it is that the emphasis is laid upon our salvation being independent of works connects our subject with the doctrine of Justification. The faith that lays hold of Christ is the highest moral act of a state of penitence: nothing more, but nothing less. It is the last and best of the fruits meet for repentance 1 John 16:9; 2 John 3:18; 3 Colossians 2:12

(3.) Hence it is plain that the faith which is saving passes insensibly while we are studying it into the state of regeneration to which it leads. As it is itself a sanctification of that original principle of belief which belongs to our nature, so itself is sanctified into the energy of the regenerate life. It becomes the law of that life, faith which worketh by love;1 it is the seventh fruit of the Spirit;2 and as such is the assurance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.3 As conscience is the consciousness of the soul as touching ethics, so faith is the consciousness of the regenerate spirit as touching all its unseen and future objects 1 Galatians 5:6; 2 Galatians 5:22; 3 Hebrews 11:1

III. Assurance belongs to this trust only in an indirect manner, as its reflex action and its gracious result, and its abiding privilege in the regenerate life. As faith is the highest negative work of repentance and passes into the energy of regeneration, so confidence in its Object, relying upon it as objective, passes into the faith of subjective assurance. But the assurance is the fruit, and not the essence, of faith. As such it will be hereafter treated Meanwhile, a few points may be noted

1. Though a distinction must be made between naked faith and assurance, it is obvious that perfect trust must in some sense be assured of the reality of its object. Saving faith in God must believe that He is and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him;1 also that Christ is and that He is the Savior of all men, specially of those that believe.2 That He is my actual Savior, and that my belief is saving, cannot be the object of faith direct; it is the reflex benefit and gift of the Holy Ghost. It is the full assurance of faith,3 the pleeroforía písteoos, in which worshippers are exhorted to draw near. As faith itself is the assurance of things hoped for,4 its plerophory is to be expected in diligent devotion: diligence to the full assurance of hope unto the end.5 The internal assurance of faith is a privilege that all may claim and expect: seasons of darkness and depression and uncertainty are only the trial of that faith of assurance; they test it, and therefore imply its presence; or, if absent, its absence is thus declared to be the result of its own failure 1 Hebrews 11:6; 2 1 Timothy 4:10; 3 Hebrews 10:22; 4 Hebrews 11:1; 5 Hebrews 6:11

2. Among the objects of St. Paul's prayer for us is the full assurance of understanding, to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, even Christ. The confidence of saving faith is, strictly

speaking, limited to the Person of the Savior, Who is revealed to the understanding, the affection, the will—that is to the penitent man—by the Holy Ghost, Who at the same time opens the spiritual eye to behold Him. But the faith which is the energy of the new life is also the spiritual eye which beholds all truth, and is assured of it As it respects the Holy Ghost this is the unction from the Holy One,1 by which we know all things; as it respects the believer this is the certain belief which makes faith knowledge

1 1 John 2:20 THE RELATIONS OF REPENTANCE AND FAITH

Repentance and Faith have certain relations which must be remembered by those who would understand both. Each precedes, while each consummates, the other; and they are united, whether in the preliminaries of salvation or in the mature Christian life

1. There is a faith which precedes repentance: belief in God's existence and revelation generally, and of the threatenings of His Word in particular, must precede supplication for His mercy. But this is the belief that lies at the root of all religion; and may be altogether independent of trust in the Gospel, or any apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ: unless indeed we import here the distinction between implicit and explicit faith

There must be a belief in God, that He is before there can be a belief that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him;1 there is a faith in the Gospel as a general economy of grace before the personal appropriating reliance on its provisions. Hence all the appeals which in Scripture enforce contrition are based upon a pre-existing knowledge of the Lawgiver and of sin and of the penalty of transgression. And every appeal to every class of sinner must needs assume the existence of faith in the righteous judgment of God against his offence

1 Hebrews 11:6

2. But repentance precedes the faith which brings salvation. Repent ye and believe the Gospel1 is the formula that never will be displaced. Though the Spirit's conviction is based on the belief that Christ is, and that He is a Lord and a Savior, into Whose hands every man's destiny is committed, yet the trust which places the mercy of the Savior before the authority of the Lord must be preceded by deep sorrow in His presence. Saving trust cannot spring up save in the contrite heart: sorrow on account of the evil of sin, anxiety to be delivered, despair of delivering oneself, and a deep feeling of Christ's atoning sorrows, must coexist in the soul which is encouraged to rely on the Redeemer's work. The same may be said of all genuine saving faith. It cannot exist where there is not humility of heart; sorrow for sin is the soil out of which it grows

1 Mark 1:15

3. Repentance and faith mutually aid if they do not actually spring out of each other. The soul when touched with true penitential grief is as it were naturally disposed to rely on the great Deliverer. There is but a step between entire self-renunciation and the acceptance of the Savior, Who fills the void of self: in fact, where the penitence is perfect, purged of all traces of its two opposite errors, despair and carelessness, trust may be said to lie at the very door. All repentance becomes in its last Evangelical analysis sorrow for the rejection of Jesus, Who in this very sorrow is accepted. But that grief arises from the Spirit's application of Christ's dying love, which is in such a state of heart really believed though it may not yet be appropriated with assurance. This faith

may be, and is in some theological treatises, called ILLUMINATION; and its combination with repentance is perceived or felt in such a passage as this: Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light,1 where it is hard to say when the one office of the Spirit passes into the other 1 Ephesians 5:14

4. Lastly, repentance and faith enter hand in hand into the new life of covenanted salvation. Legal penitence is transformed into Evangelical; and the trust that comes to Christ is the faith that abides in Him and works by love. This repentance in regenerate souls is the fellowship of our Lord's sorrow for sin. It is the interior mortification which is the crucifixion of the flesh. Strictly speaking, it is the only perfect repentance, which feels the sinfulness of sin as it never could be felt before, and more effectually than ever renounces it. Then it becomes the very mind of Christ in the believer concerning the evil of sin. This faith which unites the soul to Jesus keeps the soul in Him, and is therefore the permanent condition and instrument of all grace: deriving from their Supreme and Sole Source all the treasures of His life and power and salvation

28. Vol 02 - Historical

Historical

HISTORICAL

Ante-Nicene Pelagianism and Augustinianism in relation to Freewill and Prevenient

Grace Mediation in Semi-Pelagianism

Synergism Arminianism Methodism The theological topics which are connected with Preliminary Grace have had a very rich development in the history of opinion and controversy. Some things on this subject have been anticipated in former sections; but a few points of deep interest present themselves here

I. The relation of man’s freedom of will to the Spirit’s grace has been matter of controversy only from the time of Augustine. The ante-Nicene Church treated the question mainly with reference to the Gnostic heresies, which anticipated the theory of Determinism. The Greek and Latin Fathers alike earnestly opposed the Manichsean notion of the necessity laid on the soul through its connection with matter. But they differed in that the Greeks exaggerated the primary function of the will in originating good; whilst the Latins thought less of the will and more of the Divine influence upon it, and paved the way for the later doctrine of Prevenient Grace. Common to the whole Church for centuries was the principle: eleuthron kai autexousin epoioosen ho Theos ton anthropon: God hath made man free and master of himself. Common also was the correlative sentiment expressed by Origen: " Moral good is combined of the first choice of the soul and of the Divine power inbreathed." Common also, though more emphatically among the Latins, that of Ambrose: " Whether we think of the beginnings, or of the progress, or of the final perseverance of the faithful, there is no kind of virtue which may be regarded as without the gift of Divine grace, or without the consent of our own will." On the whole, the tendency was what afterwards was called Semi-Pelagian: grace having been regarded as influencing rather the knowledge than the volition

II. A certain doctrine of Prevenient Grace, interpreted broadly, has been taught in almost all systems. But the lax interpretation of this given by the Greek Fathers led to Pelagianism; and the emphatic assertion of a preponderating Divine influence in it was developed into Augustinianism

1. Pelagianism in the beginning of the fifth century understood by prevenient grace the innate and undestroyed capacity of the soul for good and secret bias towards it; the written law as stimulating both; and, added to this, the teaching and example and illumination of Christ. " Omne bonum et malum, quo vel laudabiles vel vituperabiles sumus, non nobiscum oritur, sed agitur a nobis. Capaces enim utriusque rei, non pleni nascimur, et ut sine virtute ita etiam sine vitio procreamur, atque ante actionem propriae voluntatis id solum in homine est quod Deus condidit. Sed Deus gratiae suae auxilium subministrat, ut quod per liberum arbitrium jubentur homines facere, facilius possent implere per gratiam, quam nos non in lege tantummodo, sed et in Dei adjutorio, confitemur. Adjuvat enim nos Deus per doctrinam et revelationem suam." These words of Pelagius

himself must be studied as containing the pith of his whole doctrine, as it has been laid down above. It was his faith that "Est in animis nostris naturalis quaedam sanctitas;" and this natural sanctity is only aided by instruction. Hence whatever preliminary grace is in the system of Pelagius is simply external instruction appealing to a nature wrong only through accident and bad example

2. Augustine’s doctrine of Preliminary Grace is the perfect opposite of this. In his doctrine freedom of will remains, but freedom only to evil. Grace acts directly and supremely on the Will. These are his careful expressions: " Gratia praevenit; voluntas comitans non ducens, pedissiqua non praevia. Operari et co-operari est a Deo. Gratia est gratis data, operans indeclina-biliter et insuperabiliter." Pelagius was right in protesting that these last words present " Fatum nomine gratiae :" Fate disguised as grace. The insurmountable objection to this dictum is that it reduces the whole of the operation of Divine influence, through the Word and in Providence, upon the general world to a mere superfluity, which was afterwards called COMMON GRACE. This is in Augustinian and Calvinistic systems opposed to what is called GRACE EFFICACIOUS: being universal and not particular; being necessarily, or at least actually, inoperative for salvation in the purpose of God. This wasted influence is opposed also to IMMEDIATE GRACE: being given through the truth and not directly influencing the will: touching the soul only through its natural affinity with its former possession, a natural affinity, however, which the theory supposes to have been lost. Hence both terms are misused. Grace is no more grace, if it does not include the saving intention of the Giver; and by being called common this grace is dishonored, suggesting at least the language used to St. Peter: that call not thou common.1 In such systems the outer court of the world is filled with a MASSA PERDITIONIS, in Augustine’s phrase; the will of the Spirit kindles life here and there when He will; and the first spark of true grace has in it all the potentiality and effectual earnest of eternal glory. There is strictly speaking no doctrine of Preliminary Grace: Enlightenment, Conversion, Repentance, Faith, are all the fruits of regeneration; and regeneration is absolutely the power of an endless life,2 though Augustine himself did not sanction the notion of his later followers concerning its indefectibility 1 Acts 10:15; 2 Hebrews 7:16

III. The mediation between Pelagianism and Augustinianism contained the principles of the truth on this subject. It may be divided into three main tendencies: Semi-Pelagianism, Lutheran Synergism, and Arminiamsm. These three advanced progressively towards a clearer view of the Scriptural doctrine

1. Semi-Pelagianism in the Latin Church, as represented by Cassian in Massilia, asserted that the power of doing what the will approved was not extinguished but rendered feeble

Prevenient Grace was found in the very contest between flesh and spirit: this being a stimulant to the pursuit of salvation. Moreover, Divine assistance was declared to be necessary to the progress and consummation of all good in man; though the beginning of that good is found in fallen human nature. In the Middle Ages most of the Schoolmen held a modification of this teaching. It was then that the distinction between two kinds of merit was introduced which has given a permanent character to the Romanist doctrine of prevenient grace. The process was thus exhibited by Thomas Aquinas: God is the Prime Mover simply. The free will cannot be converted to God, unless God Himself convert it

It is for man to prepare his mind, because he does this according to his free will; yet even this he cannot do without the help of God drawing to Himself. All things are of God originally; but whether

the universal influence is used depends upon the creature. If he disposes himself rightly, it is congruous that man doing his best should be rewarded according to Divine goodness; this is the Meritum de congruo. The Meritum de condigno is the real merit of acts proceeding from habitual grace. The false doctrine of merit infects the Romanist theology throughout: in the department of prevenient grace it mars what would otherwise be true. Among the Canons of Trent are sentences which assert that free will is by no means extinct, though enfeebled in its powers: " Si quis dixerit liberum hominis arbitrium a Deo motum et excitatum nihil co-operari assentiendo Deo excitanti atque vocanti, quo ad obtinendam justifications gratiam se disponat ac praeparet, mereque passive se habere; anathema sit." The grades and degrees of personal conduct by which the awakened sinner prepares himself for justification are all additions to the Scriptural doctrine of prevenient grace. But the fundamental principle of the whole is sound, though the tendency is towards error. The merit of congruity takes the place of the virtue of the Atonement to which all good left in man is to be ascribed: it is not merit that God rewards but the universal and free influence of the Spirit used by the sinner on his way to salvation

2. SYNERGISM was the necessary consequence in Lutheran theology of the doctrine of universal redemption. Melanchthon wrote in 1535: " Conjungi has causas, verbum, Spiritum Sanctum, et voluntatem non sane otiosam sed repugnantem infirmitatae suae Deus antevertit nos, vocat, movet, adjuvat, sed nos viderimus ne repugnemus

Chrysostomus inquit: ho dee elkon ton Boulomenon elkei. Erasmus: liberum arbitrium est facultas applicandi se ad gratiam." The watchword of Synergism was that the human will is a causa concurrens: the theological expression of Chrysostom’s " He that draweth draweth the willing mind." Man is a free agent, analogous to God the Supreme Free Agent, and his modus agendi, by which he is distinguished from natural things, remains also in his conversion. The opponents of Synergism, Flacius and others, represented the soul as absolutely corrupted in nature by the presence of sin, which is the image of Satan in him. Hence with them prevenient grace was the removal of some almost organic evil The later Evangelical divines in many ways described and made emphatic the "generale desiderium salutis." But the Lutheran teaching generally on this subject may be said to be vitiated by two errors: first, it ascribes that good in man to which converting grace appeals to nature, not wholly debased by the Fall, without laying stress on the redeeming gift of our Savior to the world; and, secondly, it makes the preliminaries of grace depend too much on the sacramental gift imparted in baptism

3. The Arminian mediation between the two extremes, generally, of Pelagianism and Augustinianism, has been referred to in some previous sections

(1) On the present topic, that of Prevenient Grace, its modern Methodist representative maintains a doctrine which is consistent throughout. It holds that there is a state of nature, as distinguished from the state of grace and the state of glory, that state of nature however being itself a state of grace, preliminary grace, which is diffused throughout the world, and visits all the children of men: not merely the remains of good untouched by the Fall, but those remains as the effect and gift of redemption. The special grace of enlightenment and conversion, repentance and faith, it holds to be prevenient only, as resting short of regeneration; but as flowing into the regenerate life. It therefore asserts, in a certain sense, the principle of a CONTINUITY OF GRACE in the case of those who are saved. But in its doctrine all grace is not the same grace in its issues, though all is

the same in its Divine purpose. It distinguishes measures and degrees of the Spirit's influence, from the most universal and common benefit of the Atonement in life and its advantages up to the consummation of the energy of the Holy Ghost which fits for the vision of God. It rejects the figment of a COMMON GRACE1 not charis sooteerios; and refuses to believe that any influence of the Divine Spirit procured by the Atonement is imparted without reference to final salvation. The doctrine of a Continuity of Grace, flowing in some cases uninterruptedly from the grace of Christian birth, sealed in baptism, up to the fullness of sanctification, is alone consistent with Scripture

1 Titus 2:11

(2.) Some other questions bearing on Repentance and Faith will be considered when Justification by Faith and the Roman Sacrament of Penance are before us. We have limited the above sketch to their connection with Prevenient Grace, which is a fundamental element in Methodist theology

29. Vol 02 - The State of Salvation

The State of Salvation THE STATE OF SALVATION: THE UNITY OF EVANGELICAL PRIVILEGES As seen in General Terms In the Spirit's Application of the One Atonement In Union with Christ In the Perfection of each Blessing as Meeting the whole Estate of Man Terminology of Internal and External Blessings Diversity in Unity Righteousness, Sonship. Sanctification By the state of salvation is here meant the circle of evangelical privileges which constitute the estate of believers in Christ and are imparted by the Holy Spirit. It is the grace, in which they stand, as distinguished on the one hand from the preliminaries of vocation, and, on the other, from the ethical duties of religion: being the issue of the former and the foundation of the latter. These privileges are variously described as pertaining to personal Righteousness, to Christian Sonship, and to the Sanctification of the Spirit: each of these being both external and imputed, and internal and real. But, while thus distinguished, they must be regarded also as one great covenant blessing of personal salvation: one as the common gift of grace, imparted by the Spirit's administration, in Christ Jesus, under various aspects. We must first study them in their general unity and then individually as distinct THE UNITY OF GOSPEL PRIVILEGES

Personal salvation is one great gift: this may be shown by the terms used to describe it; by the simultaneous impartation of its various blessings through the Spirit to faith; by the relation of all to union with Christ; by the completeness with which each meets the relative and real position of the believer; and by the harmony of the several privileges in the reception of the one Atonement. It is important to keep this unity in mind, to obviate the error of unduly refining upon the distinctness and the order of the several component gifts of saving grace

GENERAL TERMS

There are some general terms which are used to describe the blessings imparted under the Christian covenant as they are one in their diversity. These terms are taken from their relation to God the Giver; and from the result in those who receive them

1. All are summed up as the Grace of God;1 as the Grace of God that bringeth salvation;2 as the Gift by grace;3 especially as this Grace wherein we stand.4 A careful examination of these passages will show that one word GRACE includes the whole compass of the blessings of the covenant in Christ: the first as the source, the second as the universal benefit, the third in its most perfect realization. Upon this is based the distinction sometimes made between the three estates of nature and grace and glory: the middle term expressing all that lies between the access by faith into an accepted state and the entrance into life eternal. Hence the circle of privileges is sometimes termed Acceptance with God: perhaps as founded upon the words accepted in the Beloved,5 or, with which we were graced in the Beloved. There is nothing superinduced on nature and preparatory to glory which is not found in grace. But it has been already seen that the state of nature is not without the influence of a certain measure of grace 1 2 Corinthians 8:1; 2 Titus 2:11; 3 Romans 5:15-16; 4 Romans 5:2; 5 Ephesians 1:6

2. The unity of these blessings is expressed by some terms taken from the human side, or the result of their bestowment. Thus we read of the Common Salvation,1 where, as in very many other passages, such as by grace ye are saved,2 all the Gospel promise and gift is meant. Sometimes the whole Divine method of economy of grace is connected with the common gift: the Gospel of your salvation,3 the Word of this salvation.4 The privileges of the New Covenant are thus summed up as one; to be afterwards variously resolved into their component elements of sanctification, remission of sins and renewal unto life. Again it may be said that sometimes each of these several great blessings received by man stands for the compass of his privilege: Sanctification in the High-priestly prayer and the Epistle to the Hebrews, has this wide significance; just as Righteousness and the restored Sonship have in St. Paul's and St. John's writings. The compendious word Life5 sums up in passages too many to quote the entire gift of God through the mediation of Christ: it combines all that is negative and all that is positive in one term, perhaps the largest used in the New Testament. The same may be said of the Kingdom of God6 within us; as also of the Earnest7 of the Spirit imparted to believers. And, as will be more fully seen hereafter, the Atonement8 received is the epitome of all the blessings that flow from the Word of Reconciliation9 into the soul. Finally, all is the Promise in Christ by the Gospel10 of which we are partakers. It is impossible to study these various central words in their manifold connections without feeling that each is intended to describe the estate of grace as one

1 Jude 1:3; 2 Ephesians 2:5; 3 Ephesians 1:13; 4 Hebrews 7:14-15; 5 Acts 5:20; 6 Romans 14:17; 7 Ephesians 1:14; 8 Romans 5:11; 9 2 Corinthians 5:19; 10 Ephesians 3:6 THE SPIRIT'S APPLICATION OF THE ATONEMENT This Unity is further seen in the fact that the Holy Ghost administers every blessing as the special application of the Atonement

1. As to Himself in His relation to the Finished Work of Christ He is the Keeper of the mysteries of the cross; as our Lord said He shall take of Mine.1 The accomplished redemption is His treasury, out of the inexhaustible fullness of which we all receive at His hands. He is at once the Administrator of its external blessings, the Agent in imparting its internal, and the Witness of both. It is not meant that He dispenses all the provisions of the Covenant at once. But the Communion of the Holy Ghost2 is the common enjoyment of the grace of Christ imparted as the result of the Father's love in redemption. To receive the Atonement is to receive its various blessings, at least in their beginnings, at once. Justification is the reversal of a sentence at the bar; Adoption is at the same moment the reversal of a sentence that excluded from the inheritance of the Divine family; but neither can be received apart from the renewal of the soul into the new life of God and its Sanctification to His service. And all these acts are simultaneous benefits of one and the same Grace in Christ. They are all the personal application of the one sacrificial obedience to the faith inwrought by the Spirit Himself. He reveals and attests the forgiveness of sins, He reveals and inwardly persuades of the adoption of sons, and He seals the believer for God: all these at one and the same moment. And all these acts of witness He continues ever as the abiding personal seal of interest in the great redemption 1 John 16:15; 2 2 Corinthians 13:14

2. It is quite consistent with this that there is an order of thought which demands a distinction among these blessings. They belong to different relations: they are not homogeneous. Justification is perfectly distinct from adoption: the former is pronounced by the Judge, the latter by the Father. Regeneration belongs to another category: the new and filial life, though a free gift accompanying justification, is most intimately connected with adoption, which is the adoption of sons.1 It is

congruous both with reason and with Scripture to say that the regenerate children are as such adopted; and that the adopted must needs be regenerate. It is hardly reconcilable with either that the witnessing Spirit of adoption is, by that witness, the Agent of regeneration. Though the testifying Spirit is the inworking Spirit, the two operations are distinct. The love enkindled in the soul when the Divine love is shed abroad is the firstborn fruit of the Spirit2 of life, not the instrument of effecting it. Life is deeper even than love. And, finally, sanctification belongs to an entirely distinct order of thought from regeneration. Regeneration is not sanctification begun, in any other sense than justification is; nor is sanctification regeneration continued in any other sense than it is continued righteousness. In fact it involves an altogether independent idea: that of the consecration of the soul, justified and regenerate, to God But of this more hereafter 1 Galatians 4:5; 2 Galatians 5:22 UNION WITH CHRIST The Gift of the Spirit leads to Union with Christ; and in this mystical union all the high benefits derived from the Source of blessing are one. To be IN CHRIST and to have CHRIST IN us are throughout the New Testament convertible terms; but this reciprocal indwelling is mediated by the Spirit common to the Head and His members: we are ONE SPIRIT with Him if we have become members of His mystical body. He that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit.1 1 1 Corinthians 6:17

1. Now all the prerogatives of the estate of grace are ours in virtue of our union with the Lord; each of them in particular is distinctly referred to the same source. Generally, we are blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places (or things) in Christ.1 As treasured up in Him above, and our inheritance there, they melt into one indistinguishable blessing. But as the Spirit dispenses them to those who are united to Jesus on earth they are diverse, though still one in their diversity. Our fellowship with Him or in Him is our righteousness, whether as imputed justification or inherent conformity with the law. In Whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins;2 we are made the righteousness of God in Him.3Our Christian sonship is based upon the same union, whether it is adoption or regeneration: we are one with the Firstborn among many brethren.4If any man be in Christ, it is a new creation;5 and this new creation is a filial creation. He is our life; and we are quickened together with Christ6 by God, Who hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.7 Our consecration to God and interior holiness have the same ground and guarantee. Believers are sanctified in Christ Jesus.8

1 Ephesians 1:3; 2 Ephesians 1:7; 3 2 Corinthians 5:21; 4 Romans 8:29; 5 2 Corinthians 5:17; 6 Ephesians 2:5; 7 Galatians 4:6; 8 1 Corinthians 1:2

2. Thus union with Christ, incorporation by His Spirit into His mystical body, makes all the blessings of the Christian covenant one in Him. And this precious doctrine, the first declaration of which our Lord Himself uttered, pervades the New Testament. St. John gives the record of the Saviour’s great saying, reserved for the last hours of His teaching, Abide in Me, and I in you;1 which was glorified in His prayer: that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us2 . . . I IN THEM, and Thou in Me. And he has one echo at least of these very words: Hereby know we that we dwell in Him and He in us, because He hath given us of His Spirit.3 But St. Paul, who was not present when the Savior spoke to His disciples this word, has more than any other writer made it the signature of personal religion, especially of his own personal religion. To this note the Epistle to the Philippians is set; in it this union takes an unlimited variety of forms. But it is in the Epistle to the Galatians that it has its boldest utterance. There, and there alone, it has the character of a mystical, or, as is sometimes said, ethical or

moral union with the Saviour's death. Thrice the Apostle speaks of crucifixion with Christ. First of his fellowship, and that of every believer, with the virtue of His death to the law: I through the law died unto the law, that I might live unto God, I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live in the faith in the Son of God, Who loved me, and gave Himself for me.4 Here is Union with Christ's death and with His life as if both were his own through the mystical identification of faith: being dead with His Lord to the sentence of justice, he lived the life of justification. But that new life is itself the whole fullness of privilege in Christ. Secondly, he reverts to the same idea, peculiar to this Epistle, for the sake of showing that the regenerate life is fellowship with the virtue of His death to sin: They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with its passions and lusts.5 Here the union is the continuous mortification and death of the old man or the corrupt nature, signified by flesh, still remaining in the believer. Thirdly, he returns back to himself, and exults in his sense of fellowship with the virtue of His death to the world and all in it that keeps the soul from God: By Whom the world is crucified unto Me, and I unto the world.6 It were easy to show that here justification, regeneration, and sanctification, each a perfected ideal realized, are signified; that each defines for itself the whole Gospel privilege; and that all are not indistinctly based on the union of the soul by faith with the dying and the risen Savior. This for the present life; in the life to come the glory to which they lead, and for which they prepare, is in like manner the blessedness of union with the Lord: to be found in Him7 is the Apostle's utmost aspiration

1 John 15:4; 2 John 17:21; John 17:23; 3 1 John 4:13; 4 Galatians 2:19-20; 5 Galatians 5:24; 6 Galatians 6:14; 7 Php 3:9

3. This doctrine has been perverted in two ways. First, by those who resolve it simply into union with the Church and the fellowship of Christ by a genuine Christian profession: a style of interpretation which reduces the IN always to BY, in defiance of sound grammatical exegesis. Secondly, by those who interpret this mystical union with Christ as only the sovereign bestowment in time of a prerogative eternally decreed for the elect; as if salvation had been absolutely and unconditionally provided in Christ for those given to Him before the world was by the Father. But, rightly understood, there is no aspect of the common salvation more wholesome in its influence than that which makes it the fellowship of His death and life enjoyed by those who are regarded as suffering and crucified and risen and ascended with the Redeemer EACH COVENANT BLESSING PERFECT

I. There are two ways in which we may consider the unity of the great salvation of the Gospel: we may regard it as a series of bestowments of which one perfects the remainder: or we may regard each as full and complete under one special aspect. According to the former view there is first a discharge from guilt in justification, this word ending its function there, or being supplemented by adoption. The new birth is simultaneous, with its fruits and privileges. But all flows into the state of perfectness through a progressive sanctification which is entire at length and consummate. According to the latter view the unity of the blessings of the Christian covenant may be illustrated by the completeness with which each meets the twofold category of our estate as sinners: that of a position before God, and that of an internal character. The grace of redemption must needs meet both requirements. Each of the main privileges of Christianity perfectly responds to the sinner's need whether as relative or internal. His righteousness is, on the one hand, a justification in which God does not impute sin; and it is, on the other, an infused grace through which the righteousness

of the law is fulfilled in him. His sonship is similarly the adoption which places him in the relation of a child, and the new birth which makes him such. His sanctification is the external sprinkling which takes away the hindrance to his acceptance on the altar, and also the internal purification which cleanses him from all sin

Now each of these blessings makes provision for the consummation of the soul's religion under its own particular aspect: there is perfection in the presence of the law, there is perfection in the regenerate life, and there is perfection in holiness to the Lord. These points will be hereafter dwelt on

II. Meanwhile, it may be useful to consider some of the theological terms that denote the distinction above referred to, and the proprieties of their several application

1. We find it necessary to speak of ABSOLUTE and RELATIVE blessings: being more exactly counterpart terms than Relative and Real, though these two are often used, and the latter perhaps avoids a certain unconditionalness which clings to absolute. The believer's privileges are all of them inherent gifts while all of them are relative: they do now and will for ever affect his relation in the sight of God, while they are now and will hereafter more fully be the absolute possession of those who receive them: they are FREELY given, but they are freely GIVEN to us of God.1 The same truth is expressed by three other pairs of counterparts, which explain their own meaning: EXTERNAL and INTERNAL, DECLARATORY AND IMPARTED, IMPUTED AND INWROUGHT 1 1 Corinthians 2:12

2. It is obvious that FORENSIC and MORAL, as correlatives, have not so wide an application. The former belongs to the judicial court or forum, where only the absolution from guilt is received: it has not to do with sanctification, nor with adoption, unless this term is supposed to be derived from the usage of Roman law. There is a forensic justification alone; and that only in the present life; for, while the righteousness of the perfected saint will be through eternity a matter of imputation—his past sin being an everlasting fact—the court in which it is pronounced is not within the gate of heaven. It may be added that the term Imputed is conventionally limited to justification, and the term Declaratory to adoption: we speak with more propriety of an imputed righteousness than of an imputed sonship, which is the gracious declaration of the Father. And, further, though theological language generally limits the term sanctification to the internal process, it may be said also to be imputed or declared or external. But forensic of course it cannot be

3. Some other correlates may be noted, not so obvious in their meaning. The blessings of the covenant are IDEAL as they are exhibited in all their perfection in the charter; REALISED or ACTUAL as they are the general experience of Christians: this finds its illustration in St. John's unsinning regeneration: whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin;1 and St. Paul's testimony that God hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places In Christ.2 They are UNCONDITIONAL and CONTINGENT at once: the former to the Church of the elect as foreknown in Christ, according as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world;3 the latter to its militant members in probation bidden to make their calling and election sure.4 1 1 John 3:9; 2 Ephesians 1:3; 3 Ephesians 1:4; 4 2 Peter 1:10

4. It will be hereafter seen that all these several correlative terms have their uses; that the peculiarities of Romanist and Calvinistic and other errors have much to do with their perversion;

and that therefore a precise valuation of their meaning is important, both to the theologian and to the preacher. Meanwhile, the fitness with which each blessing surrounds the whole estate and conditions of the believer's life shows that the covenant salvation is but one in its diversity DIVERSITY IN UNITY

We have no better illustration of the unity which reigns in the diversity than is to be found in the diversity itself. There are no saving benefits conferred in the Christian covenant which are not connected with one or other of the three terms: Righteousness, Sonship, Sanctification. Synonyms are found of each in considerable numbers; but these are the governing formulary words, which rule respectively over wide spheres of Evangelical phraseology. While each embraces the entire estate of personal religion, and provides to present every man faultless in Christ in its own domain, they are as distinct in themselves as the terms imply; belonging respectively to the Judicial Court, the Household, and the Temple of Christianity I. RIGHTEOUSNESS presides over the Gospel as administered in the Mediatorial Court

There God is the Righteous Judge: Christ is the Mediator of a covenant of forgiveness, having offered an atonement in which the idea of satisfaction to Divine justice as the guardian of law is prominent, and in virtue of which He, as the Righteous One, is an Advocate. In that court the ungodly and the sinner appear in their special character as condemned by the law. Repentance there is simply conviction of sin and confession

There the sentence of forgiveness, or remission of penalty, and justification, or acceptance as righteous for Christ's sake, is pronounced. And the witness of the Spirit is the declaration to the conscience of pardon: giving the absolved sinner to feel that there is no condemnation. That court also demands the guarantee on behalf of everyone who is absolved that in him shall be fulfilled the righteousness of the law. All that the New Testament says concerning righteousness, throughout the whole of the stem family of terms belonging to it, is consistent with the great idea that the Gospel is administered in a court of supreme, rigid, exacting and perfect justice. Righteousness is written on its doorposts, behind its Judge, and everywhere. The two ideas of imputation and impartation are inextricably interwoven; and make the everlasting distinction between this tribunal and every human figure of it. All is judicial from beginning to end. None of the terms we have been using can be transferred, strictly speaking, to either of the other departments. To sum up: the God who presides is only a Judge: He does not pardon as a Ruler and justify as a Judge; there is no sovereign act apart from the judicial. Both in this world, and at the threshold of eternity, the Gospel is a judicial economy

II. SONSHIP is the centre of the Christian privileges which belong to the filial relation of believers to the Father in Christ. Here the whole terminology changes. The people of God are a family, in a House where the Redeemer is the Elder Brother, the Firstborn among many brethren, the Mediator of a covenant of reconciliation rather than satisfaction. The sinner is admitted as a prodigal: his regeneration is the new life given by the Spirit of Christ, and his adoption is his reinstatement in all the privileges of the household of God The Holy Ghost is the Spirit of adoption: His testimony being internal, not so much spoken to us as spoken in us, witnessing together with our regenerate spirits and enabling us to call God Father. There no law reigns save the law of internal love; and the perfection of the Christian character is that more abundant life from which sin in act and in root has vanished. Its blessing is the filial blessing; its holiness is the imitation of the

Firstborn; its food is the life of Christ pledged in the sacramental feast. It is the central and the supreme department of Christian privilege, to which alone it is said that we were predestined: to be conformed to the image of HisSong of Solomon 1:1-17 and unto adoption as sons.2 1 Romans 8:29; 2 Ephesians 1:5

III. SANCTIFICATION is the blessing imparted to believers as they are admitted into the presence and service of the God of holiness in His temple. The sinner here seeks entrance as defiled and inwardly corrupt. In the Christian temple the Savior is the High Priest, and owns no other name. He is the Mediator of a covenant ratified now, not by satisfaction nor by reconciling love, but by an expiatory sacrifice. The sprinkling of His blood removes the bar to acceptance on the altar, and the witnessing Spirit impresses the silent seal of consecration, which is His own personal indwelling in the unity of the Father and the Son. This blessing is the deliverance of the soul from all that is contrary to the pure service of God in His shrine. Perfection is here entire sanctification. The love which in the Court is the fulfillment of law, and in the House conformity with the Living law and image of the Beloved Son, is here the spring and energy of entire consecration

IV. It needs no proof that all these blessings are really one under different aspects. The sinner absolved in the Court is by the same act received in the Family and consecrated in the Temple. The Judge, the Father, and the God are One. The Advocate, the Son, the High Priest are One. The penitent who stands at the bar, who is met as a prodigal at the door, who approaches the altar of consecration with only defilement in the soul which he comes to give back to God, is one and the same penitent. The Spirit Who witnesses TO the conscience, WITH the spirit, and as a seal ON or IN the heart, is One Spirit. The perfection of each is the same perfection; and the door of each opens into the eternal Presence of God

30. Vol 02 - Christian Righteousness

Christian Righteousness CHRISTIAN RIGHTEOUSNESS: THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD Christ our Righteousness In the Gospel as a Perfect Revelation RIGHTEOUSNESS OF MAN Justification by Faith Justifying Faith

Without Works

Faith and Works

HISTORICAL

Patristic Age Mediaeval Tendencies Tridentine Doctrine Protestant Doctrine Arminian or Remonstrant Doctrine

Modern Errors This word is the centre of a number of terms which refer to the Spirit's administration of the atoning work as affecting the believer's relation to immutable right. It may be viewed objectively; and in this sense is used to describe God's method of restoring man to a state of conformity with His law: the righteousness of God, as the originating and regulative and essential principle of that method; exhibited in the work of Christ, the meritorious ground of the sinner's acceptance, or in Christ our Righteousness, and, as such, proclaimed in the Gospel, to which it gives a name. Viewed subjectively, it is the righteousness of the believer under two aspects: first, it is Justification by faith, or the declaratory imputation of righteousness without works; and then it is Justification by faith as working through love and fulfilling the law; these however constituting one and the same Righteousness of Faith as the free gift of grace in Christ THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD The Gospel is a revelation of God's righteous method of constituting sinners righteous through the atonement of Christ by faith: hence it is termed the Righteousness of God Viewed in relation to the propitiatory sacrifice, it is a manifestation of God's essential righteousness in the remission of sins; viewed in relation to the Evangelical institute, it is the Divine method of justifying the ungodly. Generally, it defines the full application of the Gospel in the mediatorial court of law, with all its effects as renewing the human spirit into perfect conformity with the Holy Lawgiver and obedience to His Law IN CHRIST OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS The mediatorial propitiation of Christ is a display of the essential righteousness of God; or, in other words, this method of providing for human justification is proved to be in harmony with the Divine perfections. The Evangelical plan of conferring righteousness rests upon the plenary satisfaction of the Divine justice in the death of man's Representative; it is the just honor put upon the merit of the Redeemer and the virtue of His work; and, uniting these, it is the promulgation of a righteous economy of gracious government exercised over mankind for His sake and by Him. The doctrine of the Atonement has exhibited this threefold truth under a more general aspect; it needs now only a brief re-statement with special reference to the judicial acceptance of the believer

1. The only instance in which our justification is immediately connected with the death of Christ is the classical passage in the Romans where St. Paul expressly declares the harmony between righteousness as a Divine attribute and righteousness as proclaimed freely for man in the Gospel.

So close is the connection that it is hard to determine to which thought the Apostle gave prominence; to the declaration of God's method of making sinners righteous, or to the vindication of His own character as just. The emphasis of the whole is laid upon the words, to declare His righteousness.1 This phrase has two variations: first, eis éndeixin teés dikaiosúnees autoú, with respect to the Divine forbearance in past ages, which required explanation; secondly, prós teén éndeixin teés dikaiosúnees autoú, with respect to the present time, after the Atonement had been offered. But both rest upon the supreme fact underlying the entire history of God's dealings with a world of transgressors: JESUS, Whom God hath set forth. proetheto, in His own eternal mind and on the scene of history, a propitiation in His blood through faith With this must be connected St. Paul's word: Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.2 The faith through which alone the objective atoning oblation of Jesus is subjectively appropriated requires the resurrection of its Object: not only as proving that we have a living and faithful Savior, but as demonstrating that His sacrifice, not for Himself but for us, was righteously honored in His being raised to confer its benefit. The substitutionary expiation of Christ as the representative Man at once exhibits the justice of God in His dealing with human sin and His righteousness in imparting forgiveness to the sinner: that He might be Just, and the Justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. This unique expression—the supreme Evangelical paradox—must be carefully noted. It is not Just and yet the Justifier, though that meaning is not far off; but it signifies that through the manifested sacrifice of Christ God is declared to be Himself just, having required that propitiation, and the Justifier, through the virtue of that propitiation 1 Romans 3:21-26; 2 Romans 4:25

2. The perfect obedience of Christ constitutes what in theology is called MERIT, and this is regarded under various aspects in the New Testament. It is rewarded in that Christ is highly exalted;1 on the ground of it the Father has perfect complacency in His Son and all who are His; and in consequence of it God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins.2 This is the truth with which we here have to do. God is faithful to the Atonement which has been faithfully offered to Him. He is righteous TO Christ as well as IN Christ. All forms of Christian theology agree with Scripture in assigning to the Redeemer's work an unlimited desert or merit. And it is this which is expressed by the universal language of dogmatic and practical theology when it pleads FOR CHRIST'S SAKE. The original of the only instance of this expression, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you,3 is en Christoo, in Christ. The additional idea of forgiveness for the sake of Christ is more suitable to St. John: if any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father.4 1 Php 2:8-9; 2 1 John 1:9; 3 Ephesians 4:32; 4 1 John 2:1 IN THE GOSPEL But the term dikaiosunoo when specifically connected with faith refers to its exhibition in the Gospel as offering and imparting the grace of a declaratory and imputed righteousness, and at the same time the power of a righteousness internal and inherent

1. The phrase is fully developed in St. Paul's writings. But the Lord Himself gave the word when He said above: seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness.1 Here both the kingdom and the righteousness are terms left to be afterwards explained throughout the New Testament. The Apostle lays down the text of his Epistle when he says to the Romans: I am not ashamed of the Gospel [of Christ] . . . For therein is a righteousness of God revealed, by faith to faith; as it is written, The just shall live by faith:2 a righteousness of faith offered to faith, or, rather, which has its individual origination in faith, and in faith has also its consummation: whether as declaratory or as inwrought it is altogether of faith. And again: but now a righteousness of God, without the law, is

manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets, even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ.3 The essential rectoral justice is manifested in the new method of Divine administration: to declare at this time His righteousness, that He might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth [in Jesus.] It is opposed to man's method: for they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God.4 So the righteousness of the law is opposed to that which is of God by faith.5 All this signifies a new relation of righteousness, which is ek Theou as it is ek pisteoos eis pistoon. It is the righteousness which God provides, on the one hand, and which, on the other, avails before God: both in one. As such it must not be limited to the establishment of a righteous relation through the imputation of righteousness: it includes God's method of making men righteous also. It is the Gospel grace generally, with all its effects, specifically viewed as bringing men to the state of dikaiosunoo, or conformity with law. But throughout, from beginning to end, it is absolutely of grace, without any merit on the part of man 1 Matthew 6:33; 2 Romans 1:16-17; 3 Romans 3:21-22; Romans 3:26; 4 Romans 10:3; 5 Php 3:1-21 L9

2. Though this Method of righteousness is as it were new, it is also the same which was from the beginning. Abel obtained witness that he was righteous1 only by faith. Noah also became heir of the righteousness which is by faith. But Abraham was the great exemplar. His faith was counted unto him for righteousness; it was faith in a promise, not given through the law, but through the righteousness of faith;2 and therefore a righteousness which was not reckoned because of the virtue of the faith in itself, or as the substitute of works. The faith rested on the early promise of acceptance by faith through a Savior as yet unrevealed. The LAW intervening did not affect the unity of this one great revelation of the only righteousness. It is the righteousness of God without the law,3 in one sense; but in another, witnessed by the law and the prophets. It was and is WITHOUT THE LAW, inasmuch as it is for ever independent of perfect obedience. But it was witnessed BY THE LAW which was a perpetual remembrancer of the impossibility of that obedience, which silently promised the Redeemer by the very fact that shortcomings were not visited, which made faith in the Covenant God and love to Him supreme, and indeed summed up all disobedience as unbelief.4 It shall be our righteousness if we observe to do all these commandments:

5 but none ever attained to that righteousness; OUR righteousness and MINE OWN righteousness were ever inapplicable words, save on the ground of the deeper foundation of the unrevealed righteousness of faith in Christ.6 The Psalms and Prophets proclaim this Divine method more fully. God's righteousness pervades both, and sometimes in terms which anticipate the New Testament. My righteousness is near! My salvation is gone forth,7 and My righteousness shall not be abolished. Righteousness and peace have kissed each other.8 THE JUST SHALL LIVE BY HIS FAITH. As the full revelation of Christ and of His kingdom waited for the New Testament, so also the full revelation of the mediatorial method of constituting men righteous: though it tarry, wait for it.9

1 Hebrews 11:4; Hebrews 11:7; 2 Romans 4:3; Romans 4:13; 3 Romans 3:21; 4 Hebrews 3:19; 5 Deuteronomy 6:25; 6 Php 3:9; 7 Isaiah 51:5-6; 8 Psalms 85:10; 9 Habakkuk 2:3-4

3. But now is this Gospel revealed. And the term Righteousness is one of its many denominations as embracing its whole design, As it is the Word, logos, or preaching of the Cross;1 of the truth;2

of reconciliation;3 of the Gospel;4 so it is also the word of righteousness:5 logos dikaiosune. It is the entire system of doctrine concerning the Divine method of conferring upon man righteousness. The whole revelation is the word of Christ,6 and of the grace of God.7 In it our Lord is the King of righteousness as He is the King of peace;8 and His kingdom is righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.9 It reveals the Lord our righteousness; as the meritorious procuring cause, the perfect example, and the Author by His Spirit of all in man that God requires and accepts as finished conformity to His law. Hence it is in all its processes the Gospel of the ministration of righteousness.10 We do injustice to this all-comprehending name of the new economy if we do not regard it as embracing the whole sum of its effects in human salvation. Viewed in our relation to the will and law of God—and that view embraces, in a sense, all our relations for time and eternity—we are altogether saved by the Gospel revelation of righteousness. The solemn question asked in the Old Testament is answered in the New: How should man be just with God?11

1 1 Corinthians 1:18; 2 Colossians 1:5; 3 2 Corinthians 5:19; 4 Acts 15:7; 5 Hebrews 5:13; 6 Colossians 3:16; 7 Acts 20:32; 8 Hebrews 7:2; 9 Romans 14:17; 10 2 Corinthians 3:9; 11 Job 9:2 RIGHTEOUSNESS APPLIED TO BELIEVING MAN The Divine method of conferring righteousness is, when viewed in relation to man who receives it, a manifestation of pure mercy, —continuing and applying the mercy of Christ's atonement, —which reckons to the believer through all the stages of his religious life, in time and in eternity, a righteousness he can never attain to or claim as his own

Whether it is regarded as accounting righteous or as making righteous—for both are certainly included—it is and must be ever a free gift to the faith that embraces the propitiation JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH

Justification is the Divine judicial act which applies to the sinner, believing in Christ, the benefit of the Atonement, delivering him from the condemnation of his sin, introducing him into a state of favor, and treating him as a righteous person. But this justifying faith is an operative principle which through the Holy Spirit's energy attains to an interior and perfect conformity with the law, or internal righteousness. The imputative character of justification, however, rules the New-Testament use of the word. Inherent righteousness is connected ordinarily with the perfection of the regenerate and sanctified life. In the more limited sense, justification is either the act of God or the state of man

I. The act of justifying is that of God the Judge. Generally it is dikaioosis, the word which pronounces the sinner absolved from the condemning sentence of the law; and it refers always and only to the sins that are past. Whether regarded as the first act of mercy, or as the permanent will of God's grace towards the believer in Christ, or as the final sentence in the judgment, it is the Divine declaration which discharges the sinner as such from the condemnation of his sin. It is God that justifieth:1 God in Christ; for all judgment is committed unto theSong of Solomon 2:1-17 who both now and ever pronounces as Mediator the absolving word, declaring it in this life to the conscience by His Spirit. It is the voice of God the Judge in the mediatorial court, where the Redeemer is the Advocate, pleading His own propitiatory sacrifice and the promise of the Gospel declared to the penitence and faith of the sinner whose cause He pleads. The simplest form in which the doctrine is stated is this: Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth?3 Here the Apostle has in view the past, the present,

and the future of the believer; the death, resurrection, and intercession of Christ; and the one justifying sentence against which there can be no appeal in time or in eternity. God is Theos ho dikaioon, in one continuous ever-present act 1 Romans 8:33; 2 John 5:22; 3 Romans 8:33-34

II. As the state into which man is introduced it is variously described according to his various relations to God and to the Mediator and to the law. As an individual sinner he is forgiven: his justification is PARDON or THE REMISSION OF SINS; that is, the punishment is remitted. As a person ungodly, he is regarded as righteous, RIGHTEOUSNESS is IMPUTED to him; or his TRANSGRESSION is NOT IMPUTED to him. His sin is pardoned, his person is justified. As a believer in Jesus, His FAITH is COUNTED FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS. All these phrases describe, under its negative and its positive aspect, one and the selfsame blessing of the New Covenant, as constituting the state of grace into which the believer has entered, and in which as a believer he abides. This is attested by passages running through the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles; passages which only confirm the promises of the Old Testament. Our Lord's forerunner was foreannounced to give knowledge of salvation unto His people by the remission of their sins.1 The Saviour's word was, Man, thy sins are forgiven thee;2 but He spoke of the publican as praying God be merciful to me a, sinner! and as going down to his house justified:3 his prayer was hilastheeti, and his blessing that he was dedikaioomenos: these words being here introduced for the first time; and, both severally and in their mutual connection, being reserved for abundant future service in the New Testament, especially in the writings of St. Paul. He left the commission that remission of sins should be preached in His name.4 St. Peter preached that remission of sins5 on the Day of Pentecost, and afterwards varied the expression, that your sins may be blotted out: counterparts in meaning. But St. Paul takes up the Saviour's own words and unites them: through this Man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by Him all that believe are justified from all things.6 And in his great Epistle he adds all the other terms, and unites the whole in one charter of privileges: But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness; even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered: blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin.7 In this classical passage all the phrases are united without exception; and they are represented both as the act of God and the state of man, the one and various blessing of habitual experience. To sum up: the state of dikaio-sunoo is that of conformity to law, which, however, is always regarded as such only through the gracious imputation of God who declares the believer to be justified negatively from the condemnation of his sin, and positively reckons to him the character, bestowing also the privileges, of righteousness. The former or negative blessing is pardon distinctively, the latter or positive blessing is justification proper 1 Luke 1:77; 2 Luke 5:20; 3 Luke 18:13-14; 4 Luke 24:47; 5 Acts 2:38; Acts 3:19; 6 Acts 13:38-39; 7 Romans 4:4-8

III. Whether the act or the state is signified the phraseology of justification is throughout Scripture faithful to the idea of imputation. The verb justify is not used of making righteous save as the notion of declaring or reckoning is bound up with it

1. The Hebrew word tsaadaqaah is almost always translated by the Septuagint in the sense of making or pronouncing righteous through a judicial sentence; and that in the negative sense of vindication and in the positive of declaring just. She hath been more righteous than I:1 Tamar was proved just, dedikaiootai. He is near that justifieth me,2 ho dikaioosas mee. One striking passage

deserves careful observation: I will not justify the ungodly,3 where, if the Septuagint had not followed another reading, we should have had the very words of St. Paul that omit the NOT, tón dikaioúnta tón asebeé;4 also Which justify the wicked for reward,5 oi dikaiounteoo ton asebh. The general strain is only confirmed by two passage which seem to be exceptions, including with the external the internal righteousness: By His knowledge shall My righteous Servant justify many.6 And they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever.7 To these may be added mataioo edikaioosa, I have cleansed my heart in vain,8 where undoubtedly our term is once used as the translation of the Hebrew taher, I made pure

1 Genesis 38:26; 2 Isaiah 1:8; 3 Exodus 23:7; 4 Romans 4:5; 5 Isaiah 5:23; 6 Isaiah 53:11; 7 Daniel 12:3; 8 Psalms 73:13

2. In the New Testament there is no exception. A few specimens will be sufficient, especially as they are taken from the Gospels as well as the Epistles. By thy words thou shalt be justified, dikaiootheésee, and "by thy words thou shalt be condemned, 1 katadikastheésee. Ye are they which justify yourselves before men, 2 katadikazo. Wisdom is justified of all her children,3 edikaioóthee, where there is both a negative and positive sense: wisdom is both cleared from imputation and highly approved, the former predominating. And the publicans justified God,4 edikaissoon. Compare also katakrima and dikaíoosin zooeés, judgment and justification of life.5 It is God that justifieth, Theós ho dikaioón; who is he that condemneth?6 Tís ho katakrinoón; Yet am I not hereby justified,7 dedikaíoomai: this does not prove me righteous. The passages in St. James, to be considered hereafter, are consistent with this. They speak of a declaratory justification, and not of the making righteous: of a justification pronounced on the evidence of works

Even those who suppose that St. James teaches a righteousness of works must admit that his use of dikaioun is quite consistent with a declaratory meaning. He is writing only of the evidences of righteousness, precisely in harmony with the Sermon on the Mount, and expressly uses the Pauline language of imputation: elogisthoo eis. He employs the word exclusively in its judicial sense. What he is pleading against is a mistaken apprehension of faith, not a mistaken apprehension of justification. The Divine judgment pronounced on Abraham’s faith8 when Isaac was promised in Genesis 15:1-21, was confirmed in the later evidence of Isaac’s surrender in Genesis 22:1-24. In the former he was justified, in the latter his justification or righteousness was acknowledged. The seeming exception in the Apocalypse is removed by the right reading, dikaiosúneen poieesátoo, let him work righteousness, and thus let him be righteous still,9 but not ho díkaios dikaiothooti éti. On the evidence of such an unvarying usage we may conclude that this word never occurs in the Scripture in relation to man’s acceptance saving in the sense of a declaratory sentence which pronounces the man righteous whom God for Christ’s sake reckons to be such

Whatever righteousness is spoken of as imparted and infused requires itself to have righteousness imputed to it. If the reading dikaiothooti éti were correct, it would only make the New Testament close with, a great testimony to the truth, That he that is righteous in his internal conformity to law must be JUSTIFIED STILL during the interval until the Lord cometh

1 Matthew 12:37; 2 Luke 16:15; 3 Luke 7:35; 4 Luke 7:29; 5 Romans 5:18; 6 Romans 8:33-34; 7 1 Corinthians 4:4; 8 James 2:23; 9 Revelation 22:11 JUSTIFYING FAITH The faith which is the

condition and instrument of justification is the trust of the soul in Christ as the only propitiation for human sin. It is a personal act of the penitent sinner under the influence of the Holy Spirit, Who reveals the Atonement to the mind, infuses desire into the heart, and thus persuades the will to embrace the Savior. This faith, as receptive, renounces self in every form, obtains forgiveness and is reckoned for righteousness: these being one blessing under two aspects. As an active principle it appropriates the promise or the virtue of Christ's atonement; and, working by love, belongs not to the entrance into justification, but to the justified state. Its genuineness is approved by Evangelical works of righteousness, without which therefore the state of justification cannot be retained. Hence there is a justification by faith without the merit of works, and a justification by faith on the evidence of works; but in both cases the justification is declaratory and altogether of grace FAITH WITHOUT WORKS

I. Faith, without works, is both the instrument and the condition of justification: as the condition, it renounces every other dependence than the Atonement; as the instrument, it embraces Christ, or appropriates the promise in Him, or rests upon His atoning work

1. The righteousness which is of God by faith is as a condition opposed to man's own righteousness, which is of the law

(1.) Faith acknowledges that the legal, proper, primitive sense of the term justify, as the pronouncing him to be righteous who is righteous, is for ever out of the question. First, as to the law: it has been broken and its condemnation is acknowledged; it demands an obedience that never has been rendered since the Fall. Then as to man himself, faith renounces all trust in human ability. It utterly abjures the thought of a righteousness springing from self. It acknowledges past sin; and present impotence; and the impossibility of any future obedience canceling the past Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.1 It disclaims all human creaturely righteousness as such: the nullity of this is taught by conviction, felt in repentance, and confessed by faith 1 Galatians 2:16

(2.) Hence the specific Evangelical phrase that faith is counted for righteousness. This implies the absence of personal righteousness, and the reckoning of a principle, not righteousness, in its stead by a kind of substitution. In its stead: not as rendering good works needless, but displacing them for ever as the ground of acceptance. Therefore faith does not justify as containing the germ of all good works: as fides formata charitate, Or faith informed and vivified by love. Not justifying through any merit in itself, it justifies as the condition on which is suspended the merciful application of the merits of Christ: kata chrin. Faith is not righteousness, as justifying: it is counted for righteousness.1 It is put to the account2 of man in the mediatorial court as righteousness; not as a good work, but reckoned instead of the good works which it renounces. Lest the faith as itself a work should be regarded as righteousness the Apostle varies the expression. He also says, again and again inversely, that righteousness—not, however, Christ's—is imputed to the believer: not to faith itself, as if God regarded the goodness wrapped up in it. The man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works . . . it was imputed to him for righteousness . . . for us also, to whom it shall be imputed.3 It is the man, in the naked simplicity of his self-renouncing, work-renouncing trust in God—in naked faith, simple faith, faith alone, words which are not in

Scripture but which sums up its meaning—on whom the sentence of justification is pronounced. When our Lord, in answer to the question, What shall we do that we might work the works of God? said, This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent,4 He did not use either of the terms, work and faith, precisely in their later sense, but prepared the way for it. He did not mean that faith in Himself was the all-comprehending virtue required by God, but that they must believe in Him before they could speak of any works at all as acceptable 1 Romans 4:4; 2 Philemon 1:18; 3 Romans 4:6; Romans 4:22; Romans 4:24; 4 John 6:28-29

(3.) Imputation or reckoning—logizomai, ellogin—has two meanings: the ascribing to one his own and the reckoning to him what is not his own. The latter sense predominates in the three great theological imputations: that of the sin of Adam to the race, that of the sin of the race to Christ, and that of the benefit of Christ's righteousness to the believer. As through the imputation of one man's disobedience many were made sinners,1 that disobedience being reckoned not in the act but in the consequence; and as the Lamb of God bore the sin of the world,2 not its sins, being made sin for us by imputation as a sin offering Who knew no sin3 Himself, so the ungodly who in penitence believes has the virtue or efficacy of Christ's obedience reckoned to him without having that obedience itself imputed: he is made the righteousness of God in Him, which is different from having the righteousness of Christ set to his account 1 Romans 5:19; 2 John 1:29; 3 2 Corinthians 5:21

(4.) This faith as a negative condition is of the operation of the Holy Ghost He enables the soul to renounce every other trust. He convinces the mind of guilt and impotence; awakens in the heart the feeling of emptiness and longing desire; and so moves the will to reject every other confidence than Christ. But, though the influence of the Spirit produces it, it is so far only negative: a preparation for good rather than itself good

2. Faith is the active Instrument as well as the passive Condition of justification. As such it apprehends Christ; justifies because of the virtue of its object as it unites the soul with Him -is blessed with the privilege of an attendant assurance; and all once more under the influence of the Holy Spirit

(1.) Faith is the instrumental cause of justification. The originating cause is the love of God; the meritorious, Christ's atoning obedience, active and passive in one, the former rendering the latter possible; the efficient cause, the Holy Ghost, working faith through word and sacrament as the secondary instruments of justification or its means. There is scarcely any room here for another so-called formal cause, which is, really, notwithstanding every argument of sophistry, the faith which makes the soul one with Christ; and that is the cause instrumental blended with the cause meritorious. To ask for the formal cause—formal being logically that which immediately constitutes a thing what it is— is simply to ask for a definition of the act and state of justification It is and must be the imputative estimate of God

(2.) The object of justifying faith is God in Christ. In this as in all I and My Father are one. Yet the specific object of justifying faith is not God absolutely, nor Christ and His revelation generally, but Christ as the mediatorial representative of sinners, and God as accepting the Atonement for man. Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.1 We have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ.2 In two ways St. Paul to the Romans describes God as the object. But believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly:3 this implies what had

preceded, the Justifier of him which believeth [in Jesus]4 and through faith, in His blood,5 or the DEATH of Christ. And, in relation to His RESURRECTION: If we believe on Him that raised up Jesus our Lord. But the God of our whole redemption in Christ is the object of faith: the God Who so loved the world that He gave His only-begottenSong of Solomon 6:1-13 Who delivered Him up for us all,7 and Who raised up Christ from the dead.8 He is the One God of the One Christ

1 Acts 16:31; 2 Galatians 2:16; 3 Romans 4:5; 4 Romans 3:25-26; 5 Romans 4:24; 6 John 3:16; 7 Romans 8:32; 8 Romans 8:11

(3.) It is never said that we are justified dia pistin, on account of faith, but dia pisteoos or ek pisteoos. Faith, as the act of the soul by which it unites itself with the Lord, makes the virtue of His merit its own. It apprehends Christ and His atonement: ascribing all to Him, it receives all from Him, This is its transcendent privilege, surpassing all recorded in the eleventh of Hebrews, or rather underlying all. It is the appropriating knowledge of Christ: that I may win Christ is that I may know Him.1

1 Php 3:8-10

(4.) Faith is not assurance: but assurance is its reflex act. The same Spirit who inspires the faith—which is alone, and without assurance, the instrument of salvation—ordinarily and always, sooner or later, enables the believer to say: He loved me and gave Himself for me.1 The objective and the subjective confessions of personal experience have become one; but St. Paul here speaks out of the treasure of in internal assurance which followed his first act of faith. So he writes to the Ephesians: In Whom also, after that ye believed— or, on your believing—ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise.2 1 Galatians 2:20; 2 Ephesians 1:13

(5.) Faith, whether receptive or active, is an exercise of the human heart under the influence of the Holy Spirit: not merely under that general agency by which all preliminary grace is wrought, but through His actual revelation of Christ to the soul, the eyes of which are at the same moment opened: the unveiling of the Savior to the penitent seeker, and the unveiling of the sight to look to the Lamb of God,1 in one and the same critical moment is the mystical but true and sufficing definition of saving trust. It must be remembered, further, that the active energy and the passive renunciation of saving faith are brought to the perfection of their unity at that moment. St. Paul puts this strikingly when he speaks of the Jews as not submitting themselves unto the righteousness of God.2 Submitting marks the negative, themselves the positive side: ouch hupetágeesan 1 John 1:36; 2 Romans 10:3

FAITH AND WORKS

Faith, with works, justifies instrumentally the person believing: inasmuch as its works give evidence of its genuineness as a permanent living principle. It retains the soul in a state of justification, and is the power of a Divine life by which the righteous-ness of the law is fulfilled

1. The works of faith declare the life and reality of the faith that justifies. Those works did not declare its genuineness at first, when forgiveness was received: God imputeth righteousness 'without works . . . through the righteousness of faith.1 But afterwards, and to retain that justification, its works must absolutely be produced. I will shew thee my faith by my works.2 In the whole sequel after receiving Christ, by works a man is justified and not by faith only; that is,

rearranging the words without violating their sense, a man is justified not by faith only—which in this connection is no faith at all—but by faith living in its works. As the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also.3 Here is the origin of the phrase Living or Lively faith; it is remarkable, however, that the invigorating principle is not from the faith to the works but from the works to the faith The faith is the body, the works the spirit: a seeming anomaly which plainly shows St James to be contrasting two kinds of faith only 1 Romans 4:6; Romans 4:13; 2 James 2:18; James 2:21; James 2:24; 3 James 2:26

2. The expression Living Faith, just used, suggests the vital relation of 'this subject to union with Christ. When St. Paul says that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him,1 the word genoómetha means more than the non-imputation of sin which has been spoken of before. That we might become: our forensic justification being included of necessity, our moral conformity to the Divine righteousness cannot be excluded. These closing words are a resumption, but in a more emphatic and enlarged form, of the preceding paragraph, which ended with if any man be in Christ he is a new creature.2 The righteousness of God in Him is the full realization of the new method of conforming us to His attribute of righteousness. It is impossible to establish the distinction between IN CHRIST for external righteousness, and CHRIST IN us for righteousness internal. These are only different aspects of one and the same union with Christ. Still, the distinction may be used for illustration. Grace is given in the Beloved, in Whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins,3 in order that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith:4 that His grace may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus.5 The vital union of faith secures both objects: our being reckoned as righteous because found in Him, and our being made righteous because He is in us as the Spirit of life6 and strength unto all obedience: that the righteousness of the law may be fulfilled in us. He that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit;7 and this Holy Spirit, common to Him and to us, gradually realizes the ideal righteousness of God within by a sure necessity. Gradually, for we wait for the hope of righteousness by faith;8 but while this work is in process its perfection is always anticipated by the imputation of grace, and righteousness is reckoned to cover its sin of defect. While the imputation of God reckons its final perfection to the righteousness which is begun, we ourselves also are exhorted to reckon ourselves dead indeed unto sin:9 this imputation in ourselves answering to imputation in God. In what sense dead to sin has been already explained, for he that is dead is justified from sin.10 During the process the song is In the Lord have I righteousness and strength.11 But when it is accomplished the perfection is from Him and not our own. He is for ever and ever THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.12 Abraham believed in the Lord, and He counted it to him for righteousness.13 Afterwards by faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac,14 and therefore was not Abraham our father justified by works?15 Faith and Works may be used interchangeably as to abiding state:16 they are together and one. St. Paul and St. James agree that the state of Justification is that of a faith which worketh by love.17 St. John mediates, he that doeth righteousness is righteous:18 this would be tautology did he not mean that the righteous man—he who in the well-known terminology of St. Paul, which St. John does not use, is the justified man—is one who worketh righteousness, even as He is righteous Who is the Author and Pattern and Finisher of human righteousness

1 2 Corinthians 5:21; 2 2 Corinthians 5:17; 3 Ephesians 1:6-7; 4 Ephesians 3:17; 5 Colossians 1:28; 6 Romans 8:2; Romans 8:4; 7 1 Corinthians 6:17; 8 Galatians 5:5; 9 Romans 6:11; 10 Romans 6:7; 11 Isaiah 45:24; 12 Jeremiah 23:6; 13 Genesis 15:6; 14 Hebrews 11:17; 15 James

2:21; 16 Genesis 22:15-19; 17 Galatians 5:6; 18 1 John 3:7

3. The justification of faith itself in and through its works forms the Scriptural transition to internal and finished righteousness, which however is generally viewed as entire sanctification: improperly, however, if sanctification is regarded as finishing what righteousness leaves incomplete. To him who insists upon bringing in the doctrine of sanctification to supplement as an inward work what in justification is only outward St James replies: Seest thou how faith wrought with his works,1 and by works was faith made perfect?2 Here is the finished result of faith which worketh by love; that one and indivisible work of faith,3 in the assertion of which at the outset of his teaching St. Paul by anticipation declared his agreement with St. James. Both these Instructors in Christ4 show that justifying faith in a consummate religion eteleioothoo, is MADE PERFECT in its effects; and both with reference to the law, as against Antinomian renunciation of it. St Paul uses another term which again shows his full agreement with St. James, pleerootheé: the juxtaposition of these two terms is perhaps their best reconciliation. That the requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit:5 here righteousness fulfilled is not the claim of justice satisfied in punishment but its requirements satisfied in love. If, in any sense whatever, RIGHTEOUSNESS is FULFILLED IN us, that must be by our being MADE RIGHTEOUS while reckoned such. But always, whether at the outset when works are excluded, or in the Christian life when they are required, whether in earth or in heaven, justification will still and ever be the IMPUTATION OF RIGHTEOUSNESS TO FAITH. The works which follow and give evidence will only declare that the faith in Christ was genuine and living faith. This alone can secure eternal life to those who, though as holy as their Lord Himself and as blessed as His joy can make them, will be apart from Him and in the record of the past sinners still Of whom I am chief!6 was St. Paul's word when ready to be offered;7 and he and all true believers will then look as they are now looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life.8 The profound consideration of this truth in all its bearings, it may be said in conclusion, will furnish the secret of the defense of the Evangelical doctrine of justification against all the perversions which will hereafter be reviewed 1 James 2:22; 2 Galatians 5:6; 3 1 Thessalonians 1:3; 4 1 Corinthians 4:15;

5 Romans 8:4; 6 1 Timothy 1:15; 7 2 Timothy 4:6; 8 Jude 1:21

HISTORICAL The doctrine of the Divine Righteousness for man and in man, as the Apostle Paul first systematically taught it, was not clearly and soundly unfolded in the dogma of the Church until the Reformation. But the Scriptural doctrine was never absent. Though the distinction between the righteousness imputed to the believer and the righteousness wrought out in him was too much lost sight of, the great Evangelical provision for setting man right with the law through the Atonement has never been without its witnesses THE PATRISTIC AGE The early Fathers never make the distinction which more modern discussions have rendered necessary

1. Clemens Romanus, the first of them, fairly represents the general strain in such language as this: " They all [the Fathers of the Old Covenant] received honor and glory not for their own sake, nor through their own works, nor through their own righteous acts, but through the will of God. So also we, who are called in Jesus Christ by His will, are not justified through ourselves (ou di eautoon dikaioumetha), nor through our own wisdom or knowledge or devotion, nor through the works which we have wrought in holiness of heart, but through faith; by which the Almighty hath justified all from the beginning." And again: " Let us rightly prize the blood of Christ and see how

precious His blood is to God, as that which, poured out for our salvation, hath obtained the grace of repentance for all (metanoias charin)." But in the same first document we read: " Love binds us to God; in love hath the Lord accepted us; in love have all the elect been perfected; without love nothing is wellpleasing to Heaven." "Happy are we, if we obey the Lord's commandments in the purpose of love, that through love our sins might be forgiven to US (eis too aphethoonai umin di agapoos tas amaptias homon):" dia toos pisteos is followed by di agapoos, a striking variation from the exact words of the Apostle: not by faith which worketh by love but by love. It is obvious that these expressions are equally consistent with a justification by faith and a justification by works: supposing the distinction between reckoning and constituting righteous not to be dwelt on. This earliest Father evidently makes no difference between faith as the principle and love as its expression. He further says: " How do we attain the blessings of salvation? When our mind is firmly directed to God in faith, when we labor after that which is wellpleasing to Him, putting away from us all unrighteousness." The same combination of faith and love is found in Ignatius: "If ye in perfect measure have faith and love towards Jesus Christ, which are the beginning and end of life: the beginning (archoo) is faith, the end (telos) is love; these, united in one, are of God." Irenseus says: " If ye avow this in penitence for your sins, in acknowledgment of Jesus, as the Christ and in observance of His commandments, ye shall have forgiveness of sins." And again and again he blends faith and obedience in our justification. So also does Clemens Alexandrinus. Origen's doctrine tends the same way; though on this, as on many other points, it is hard to reconcile him with himself, as will appear from the following passages. " I find not in Scripture that faith is reckoned to him who believes for righteousness, but only that full faith which includes the departure from sin ... The root of righteousness is not of works, but from the root of righteousness the fruit of works grows . . . This faith the Apostle speaks of as a gift of the Spirit, and therefore of free mercy." But how anxious he was to make justifying faith dependent on the works which make it perfect appears from many parts of his writings: " For it is not possible that righteousness can be imputed to him who has in himself any unrighteousness, even though he may believe in Him who raised Jesus from the dead." It is obvious that the ante-Nicene Fathers based their doctrine of the righteousness of faith upon what we now call a reconciliation of St. Paul and St. James. They knew nothing of a direct imputation of the Saviour's merits; they knew nothing of a righteousness imputed to the good works which faith produces; but they held fast a justification of the believer through that faith alone, which approves itself in holy life

2. It is remarkable that the East was, on the whole, more faithful than the West to Pauline phraseology. Origen, Theodoret, and Chrysostom, among the Orientals, explain dikaioun as dikaion apothainein, with much emphasis on its being the forgiveness of sins. But Augustine makes justification equivalent to JUSTUM FACERE. It is vain to seek in his writings a clear expression of St. Paul's doctrine. There is invariably a reference more or less direct to the works wrought in the believer: " Justificamur in Christi sanguine, dum per remissionem peccatorum eruimur a diaboli potestate." "Gratia Dei Justificamur, h. e justi efficimur." " Justificat impium Deus non solum dimittendo quae mala fecit, sed etiam donando caritatem, ut declinet a malo et faciat bonum per Spiritum Sanctum.'' Here it is plain that the terminology of St. Paul is tampered with. No passage in his writings identifies righteousness with the indwelling gift of charity. There is however a remarkable homage paid to the Apostle's doctrine in a memorable sentence of Augustine: " Sequuritur opera JUSTIFI-CATUM, non praecedunt JUSTIFICANDUM." 3. It may be said that all this was no more than the establishment of the strict union and due proportion between the

external and the internal righteousness that belong to salvation. But there was in such language the germ of great errors, which may be traced in various directions. Though the works of a living faith were demanded, the maintenance of the Catholic objective creed of the one church was in the second century and afterwards made suspiciously prominent. With this may be paralleled the Alexandrian distinction between the psiloo pistis and the gnosis, springing out of it, which made it living. Good works were very early, even by the earliest Fathers, incautiously represented as co-ordinate with faith in the matter of justification. Satisfaction —including penance, good works, almsdeeds and intercession of martyrs—was inculcated as necessary in order to the forgiveness of sins committed after the baptismal forgiveness had been lost

Augustine himself uses such language as this: " Non sufficit mores in melius mutare et a factis malis recedere, nisi etiam de his, quae facta sunt, SATISFIAT Deo per poenitentiae dolorem, per humilitatis gemitum, per contriti cordis sacrificium, CO-OPERAN-TIBUS eleemosynis." This REMISSIO SECUNDA introduced a fatal change into the Scriptural doctrine. Lastly, the ascetic distinction between simple acceptance in doing the COMMANDMENTS and the higher worthiness of following the COUNSELS of the Gospel, perverted the true doctrine for ages. The first note of this permanent error is found in Origen: " Donec quis hoc facit tantum quod debet, i.e., quae praecepta sunt, inutilis servus est. Si autem addas aliquid praeceptis, tunc dicetur ad te, Euge, serve bone et fidelis!"' But the fundamental error was the misapprehension of the idea of justification; making it not the declarator of a man’s righteousness—to which all must come at last however perfect the internal righteousness—but the making him righteous

4. But, after every deduction for the signs of coming error, it is indisputable that the best of the Fathers, whether of East or of West, furnish a consensus of faithful testimony to the Scriptural doctrine of the sinner’s acceptance with God on the sole ground of the Redeemer’s finished work. It may be granted that they do not use modern language: such terms as Imputed Righteousness and Forensic Justification are unknown to them. Also that they apply the term Merit in a sense from which we now decline: meaning, not so much legal or moral desert, as the gracious estimate attached by God to His own good in man. Also that the term Justification itself was used in its largest meaning, as the constituting and making men righteous through the efficacy of the Atonement applied to the whole nature and life of the sinner. The Fathers regarded faith as the principle which not only apprehends Christ’s merit for forgiveness but unites the soul with Him for constant interior renewal. And Augustine, who is generally appealed to, and not without justice, as sanctioning a moral justification and even a justification conditioned by works of satisfaction, is faithful to the supremacy of Christ’s merits relied on by the penitent believer. This is his catena of grace: "Faith is the first link of the gracious chain which leads to salvation. By the law comes the knowledge of sin, by faith the attainment of grace against sin, by grace the healing of the soul from the stain of sin, by the healing of the soul full freedom of the will, by the freed will love to righteousness, and by love to righteousness the fulfilling of the law." But it is in the deep expressions of his experience, when he is not controversial, that we discover the essential soundness of his doctrine. " Our righteousness is true, on account of the truly good which is before it, but in this life it is so slight and impoverished that it rather consists only in the forgiveness of sins; potius peccatorum remissione, quam perfectione virtutum. The prayer which every member of the pilgrim church utters, Forgive us our trespasses, bears witness to this. This prayer is not efficacious for those whose faith without works is dead; but for those whose faith worketh by love."

" My sole hope rests on the death of My Savior. His death is my merit, my refuge, my salvation, my life, my resurrection: my merit is the mercy of the Lord-He who doubts of the pardon of sins denies that God is merciful" This is the spirit of the testimony of all the Fathers. The more carefully their language is considered, the more evident will it appear that they regarded righteousness as springing entirely from faith in the Savior; and excluded good works from any meritorious share in its attainment. The attacks made upon their teaching in modern times may generally be traced to some peculiar error in the assailants themselves. They do not find their own view of justification in the early writers; and do not scruple to assert that the full exhibition of grace was lost for a long number of ages. The exhibition of truth that has been set forth above has nothing to fear from an examination of the best Christian writers of antiquity: due allowance being made for difference of phraseology and the influence of current errors upon their modes of statement MEDIAEVAL TENDENCIES The Mediaeval doctors took two directions, the majority tending towards the later theology of Rome or preparing its elements. The Church steadily relapsed into a position of slavery to ceremony and works. Christendom became a great legal economy, strictly and in an unevangelical sense a NEW LAW; the Church itself became the Mediator instead of Christ; and justification as taught by St. Paul bade fair to vanish from her teaching. But, on the other hand, the darkest period furnished bright and clear testimony that the true Gospel was only obscured I. The doctrine of the subjective application of the Atonement, like that of the Atonement objective, was perverted

1. The dogma of Merit, as already seen, had its pernicious effect, both in regard to the preparations for justifying grace, and the grace of justification itself. The MERITUM DE CONGRUO, resulting from right behavior towards prevenient grace, almost demanded from God’s equity the indwelling grace of justification by virtue of which MERITUM DE CONDIGNO, desert of salvation in strict right, is acquired. This could not fail to mar the freeness and pure grace of the Divine act. However congruous it may be with the Divine fidelity to justify the penitent who brings the fit preparation for that blessing, merit can have no place; for the preliminary fitness is itself of pure grace. And the only merit concerned with justification itself is that of Christ

2. Justifying Faith was made—as it has continued in the dogma of Rome—an actus intellectus, receiving its meritorious virtue through love. The Schoolmen distinguished two kinds of faith: FIDES INFORMIS, which simply believes the articles of the creed, touching God and Divine things, by an explicit faith where these articles are known, and by an implicit faith where they are not clearly apprehended; and FIDES FORMATA CHARITATE, which then, as shown in love, is VIRTUE, This righteousness is imputed to the faith itself, as having in it the germ of all excellence, not to the believer as such

3. Hence justification was dispossessed of all that was forensic, and became "actio Dei physica:" righteousness infused, making a man just instead of unjust. Therefore it could never be regarded as a settled and fixed act of God, and never as matter of certain assurance to its possessor. Justification in this system, confirmed at Trent, is the process of a transmutation from a state of sin to a state of righteousness, in virtue of which the justified can accomplish works entitling to eternal life: opera meritoria proportionata vitae aeternae. It is remarkable that Thomas Aquinas, the highest authority among the Schoolmen before Trent, lays great stress upon the instantaneousness of this act, confounding justification not so much with sanctification as with the infusion of the regenerate life. The following are some of his sentences: " In justification requiritur

actus fidei quantum ad hoc, quod homo credat Deum esse justificatorem per mysterium Christi." "Homo per virtutes justificatur; per fidem justificatur." "Charitas facit effectum infinitum, dum conjungit animam Deo justificando impiam." " Tota justificatio impii originaliter consistit in gratiae infusione. Per eam enim et liberum arbitrium meretur et culpa remittitur: gratiae autem infusio fit in instanti." This last sentence will be seen to be in strange contrast with the later doctrine of Rome, which asserts that believers through good works MAGIS JUSTIFICANTUR. But all the Schoolmen had lost the Scriptural distinction between the sinner's renewal unto holiness and the sentence of justification which declares his acceptance

4. The tendency of Mediaeval doctrine was towards the same errors by which the early Fathers were ensnared. What we saw in the germ has become more developed. The present and eternal acceptance of the sinner for the sake of Christ alone, never rejected absolutely, was denied by implication: the absolute supremacy of the Saviour's merit was reserved for the original fault of the race; for sin committed after its first imputed benefit, human expiation was demanded. Secondly, the peculiarity of the Apostolical term justification, as referring to a sinner's relation to law, was all but entirely abolished

Justification was said to make the sinner a saint and meet for heaven; and thus the word did duty for the renewal and entire sanctification of the soul. It was forgotten that, because the LAW will for ever have its charge against him—as apart from Christ, —he must for ever be JUSTIFIED BY GRACE THROUGH FAITH. Thirdly, the fatal dogma of Supererogation, based upon the figment of a possible superfluous merit acquired by observance of the Counsels of Perfection, laid the broad and deep foundation of the practice of Indulgence. This profoundly affected the doctrine of Justification, whether viewed as Pardon or as Righteousness. Fourthly, and this was the climax of mediaeval error, the one eternal and finished sacrifice of Christ was taken from the direct administration of the Holy Ghost, and changed into a sacrifice offered by the Church through her priests, with special application according to the intention of the human administrator. The combination of all these influences gradually introduced another gospel, preached no longer to a faith that brings neither money nor price

II. But there was also throughout the Mediaeval period a sound practical confession, silently protesting against the theories of the schools j and showing that the whole head was not sick, the whole heart was not faint. The sickness of the Church's teaching was not unto death: the light of the Deformation was already arising in the midst of the darkness

1. A long and affecting series of testimonies might be gathered from the Schoolmen of all shades, in proof that the hearts of the penitent saints always turned for justification solely to the merits of Christ. Thus Anselm who did so much to establish the foundations of the Atonement as a doctrine, could hardly fail to be sound as to its application. Among many evidences of this may be quoted his counsel to a dying sinner: "Huic morti te totnm committe, hac morte te totum contege eique te totum involve. Et, si Dominus te voluerit judicare, dic: Domine, mortem Domini nostri Jesu Christi objicio inter me et judicium tuum; aliter tecum non contendo. Si dixerit, quod merueris damnationem, dic: mortem domini nostri Jesu Christi objicio inter me et mala merita mea, ipsiusque dignissimae passionis meritum affero pro merito, quod habere debuissem et heu non habeo. Dicat iterum: mortem Domini nostri Jesu Christi pono inter me et iram tuam. Deinde dicat ter: In manus tuas commendo spiritum meum. Et conventus sui adstantes respondeant: In manus

tuas, Domine, commendamus spiritum ejus. Et securus morietur nec videbit mortem in aeternum." In his Meditations also we hear Anselm thus speaking to his soul: " When I look at the offences which I have committed, if Thou shouldst judge me as I have deserved, I am certainly lost; but when I look at Thy death, which Thou didst suffer for the world's redemption, I cannot despair of Thy compassion." And the comparative absence of confidence noticeable here is elsewhere relieved: " O how should we hope in a perfect healing; and in this hope joyfully labor for our purification!" Thus Bernard also abounds with sayings which breathe the purest aspirations after a righteousness assured to faith working by love, without any human merit. It was he who said: " sufficit ad meritum scire quod non suffieiant merita." In one of his sermons there are sentences of which Luther made great use: " It is necessary first of all to believe that thou canst not have the remission of sins save through the indulgence of God; then that thou canst have no good works unless He give thee this; and, lastly, that eternal life cannot be merited by any good deeds, unless these be themselves freely given. The merits of men are not such that for their sake eternal life is by right due to them, or that God would be unrighteous in withholding it. For, not to say that all merits are God's gifts, man being God's debtor and not God man's debtor, what are all merits in comparison with such glory?" In his Discourses on the Canticles also Bernard utters some sentences that are perfectly free from the error of the times: " Truly blessed is only the man to whom God imputeth not sin. For there is none without sin. Yet who can condemn the elect of God? Enough is it to me for the possession of righteousness that I have Him against Whom alone I have sinned as a reconciled God. All that He has decreed not to reckon to me is as if it had never been. Not to sin is God's righteousness, man's righteousness is the forgiveness of God." " I am not poor in merit so long as He is not poor in mercy. If His compassion is rich I am rich in merit, and shall eternally praise the Lord of eternal mercy. Is it my righteousness that I think of? No, Lord, only of Thine; for even IT is MINE. Thou art made of God righteousness to me have I aught to fear that the one is not enough? It is broad enough for us both." Preaching on the text "Savor of the Good Ointments," he delivers these testimonies, which are fragments of a sermon profoundly interesting in itself as a contribution to the doctrine of justification: " The Church could not run after Him if He, with the Father from the beginning, had not been made unto her Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification, and Redemption; wisdom through teaching; righteousness, through absolution from guilt; sanctification, through the communion with sinners into which He has entered; redemption, through the passion He endured for sinners. This is the savor of Him Whom the Father hath anointed with oil of gladness above His fellows . . .. By righteousness through faith He hath loosed thy bonds of sin, justifying the sinner in free grace (gratis justificans); further, He lived holy among sinners, and so opened up and showed the only way of life for them; and, finally, to make the measure of His love full, He gave His life to death, and shed out of His side the price of satisfaction, the blood of atonement." The following sentences must be pondered as he wrote them: " Non est quod gratia intret, ubi jam meritum occupavit. Deest gratiae quicquid meritis deputas. Nolo meritum, quod gratiam excludat. Horreo quicquid de meo est, ut sim meus, nisi quod illud magis forsitan meum est, quod me meum facit. Gratia reddit me mihi justificatum gratis et sic liberatum a servitute peccati." It is not a sound doctrine that takes exception to these last words: Christian righteousness is an internal as well as an external deliverance. And these are but specimens of many that might be adduced to show that in the age which prepared for the Council of Trent the sole ground and meritorious cause of justification before God was acknowledged by many to be the righteousness of Christ, and the good works of man whether before or after

justification to be of no value in themselves

2. During the latter part of the Middle Ages Mysticism gave its distinct coloring to this as well as to all the doctrines which connect the sinner with his Savior. It is not easy to define precisely who in this relation may be termed the Mystics. In a certain sense such were all the noblest spirits of the Schoolmen, from Anselm and Bernard down to Gerson and the immediate precursors of the Reformation. The passages quoted above, however, separate these authors as to the present question from the Mystics proper, though they generally belonged to the same class. The characteristic principle of Mysticism was the absorbing desire after union with God. This was, and ever is, its ruling idea. Applied to the doctrine of righteousness through Christ it had these two effects, or this one effect under two aspects: first, it gave supreme ascendancy to the love of the faith that embraces Christ; and, secondly, it made Christ's internal union with the soul the secret of its righteousness. It did not entirely neglect, but it made entirely subordinate, the virtue of the Atonement as reckoned to the soul for present and eternal acceptance. This phase of doctrine must be considered elsewhere more generally: now we have to do with its mediation between the legalized and enslaved mediaeval Church and the freed teaching of the Reformation. It is enough to say that in the long series of the purest and most saintly mystical writers the love which seemed to displace faith as the condition of acceptance was in reality no other than faith itself in its self-renouncing and Christembracing character; and, secondly, that the internal Christ Whose indwelling was regarded as the formal cause or principle of justification was such as utterly extinguishing self. Their language was incorrect, and their idea of righteousness confused; but their theology was in its deep foundation opposed to the legal spirit of the system to which they belonged

3. As we approach the Reformation witnesses abound with their testimony that both scholastic definitions and mystical meditations were steadily tending in one direction

Among many we may bring forward Staupitz: " No man can be relieved of his sin but through faith in Christ alone. Apart from Him there is no confession, no repentance, no work of man: we must believe in Christ, or die in our sins. Therefore it is far more needful to exercise ourselves in faith than in a book of penitential discipline. Faith in Christ never faileth it obtains mercy from God, and renews the whole man. Come and buy without money; ye have nothing to pay for it; but shall be justified only through grace and the redemption which is in Christ, Whom God hath set forth as our only Savior, only through faith in His blood-shedding, for the manifestation of His righteousness. By faith we are saved without the works of the law." But in another chapter the mystical element comes in: " Faith in Christ lets no man abide in himself; it fails not till it unites us wholly with God. And this is the true faith, which is Christ dwelling within us." These passages combined indicate the junction between the two tendencies to which reference has been made. They express the hidden thoughts that were working in multitudes of minds, however confused in their utterance
THE TRIDENTINE DOCTRINE

There can be no doubt that the Sixteen Decrees and Thirty-three Canons of the Council of Trent, which denounced in its sixth session, 1547, the errors of Protestantism, contain the authoritative decisions of the Church of Rome on the subject of Justification. But these must be examined in the light both of a previous history and of a subsequent development

I. The Council of Trent was assembled as the protest of Rome against Protestantism: the question of Justification was only one, though one of the chief, which it aimed to settle

During the interval between the Diet of Augsburg, with its Confession, and the Diet of Ratisbon, a little more than ten years, many attempts were made by the old Church to compromise. The Interim Article, holding fast the essential Mediaeval idea that justification is the making righteous, endeavored to graft an imputation upon that: " Sinners are justified by a living and effectual faith—per fidem vivam et efficacem— which is a motion of the Holy Spirit, whereby, repenting of their lives past, they are raised to God, and made real partakers of the mercy which Jesus Christ hath promised." It admitted that sinners "cannot be reconciled to God, or redeemed from the bondage of sin, but by Jesus Christ, our only Mediator;" that "faith justifies not, but as it leads us to mercy and righteousness, which is imputed to us through Jesus Christ and His merits, and not by any perfection of righteousness which is inherent in us, as communicated to us by Jesus Christ;" and that "we are not just, or accepted by God, on account of our own works or righteousness, but we are reputed just on account of the merits of Jesus Christ." Whatever ambiguity may remain in the sentence concerning the faith working by love that justifies, and that we are made real partakers of mercy, there can be no doubt that the substantial truth was once more within the reach of the Church of Rome and was rejected

II. The specific doctrine of Trent may be viewed as to the preparations, the bestowment and the results of justification. On each of which a few remarks may be made from our own position in passing, and without direct reference to the controversy of the times

1. The Preparation for the estate of justification is a very important element in the doctrine. It is regarded as the result of prevenient grace, with which man may co-operate and which he may reject: Ita ut tangente Deo cor hominis per Spiritus Sancti illuminationem, neque homo ipse nihil omnino agat, in-spirationem illam recipiens, quippe qui illam et abjicere potest, neque tamen sine gratia Dei movere se ad justitiam coram illo libera sua voluntate possit. This is sound; but the successive steps of preparation, passing through belief of the truth into acceptance of baptism, are supposed to constitute a certain merit of congruity which notes the beginning of error. This, however, was obviated, in word at least: GRATIS justificari dicimur, quia nihil eorum, quae justificationem praecedunt, sive fides sive opera. ipsam justificationis gratiam promeretur. Si enim gratia est, jam non ex operibus. Bellarmine quotes the language of the Council: Synod. Trid. septem actus enumerat, quibus impii ad justitiam disponuntur, videl. fidei, timoris, spei, dilectionis, poenitentiae, propositi suscipiendi sacramenti et propositi novae vitae atque observationis mandatorum Dei; and adds, per fidem nos placere Deo et impetrare atque aliquo modo merere justificationem. But the distinction between merit E CONGRUO and merit E CONDIGNO is perilous. It has been shown what is the relation of faith to this justification as one of its preliminaries and the most important of them. It is the assent to the doctrine of God as taught in the Catholic Church: quod a Deo traditum esse sanc-tissimae matris ecclesiae autoritas comprobavit. In its form, it is assent; in its matter it is EXPLICIT assent to the main doctrines, and the IMPLICIT assent of goodwill to whatever the Church commends to faith. Generally, this faith is humanae salutis initium, fuudamentum et radix omnis justificationis. At a later stage comes the fides formata, or faith filled with the germs of all good; and this faith, instinct with holiness, is justifying because God beholds the hidden man who is under the process of renewal

2. On the accomplishment of the preparations justification follows: quse non est sola peccatorum remissio, sed et sanctificatio et renovatio interioris hominis per voluntariam susceptionem gratiae et donorum unde homo ex injusto fit justus, ex inimico ami-cus,ut sit haeres secundum spem vitae etenae. Non modo reputamur, sed vere justi nominamur et sumus, justitiam in nobis recipientes justitia Dei, qua nos justos facit, qua videlicet ab eo donati reno-vamur spiritu mentis nostrae et non secundum propriam cujusque dispositionem et co-operationem. Quanquam nemo possit esse justus, nisi cui merita passionis Jesu Christi communicantur, id tamen in hac impii justificatione fit, quum ejusdem sanctae passionis merito per Spiritum Sanctum caritas Dei diffunditur in cordibus eorum qui justificantur, atque ipsis inhaeret, unde in ipsa justificatione cum remissione peccatorum haec omnia simul infusa accipit homo per Jesum Christum, cui inseritur, fidem, spem et caritatem. Hence the Tridentine idea of justification is that of making righteous; while it is of grace through Christ there is in it no imputation of righteousness; though a non imputation of sin is admitted, justification and regeneration and renewal are confounded and made one. Some sentences seem to contain a condemnation of the doctrine of the acceptance of the sinner through grace: Si quis dixerit homines justificari vel sola imputatione justitiae Christi, vel sola peccatorum remissione, ex-clusa gratia et charitate, aut etiam gratiam qua justificamur esse tantum favorem Dei, anathema sit. This expressly opposes the Scriptural doctrine of justification as forgiveness and the imputation of righteousness to faith: but if the term justification is enlarged, so as to include the whole process of the renewal of the soul, the words are correct. They are wrong inasmuch as they deny that there is a distinction between the acceptance for Christ’s sake and the acceptance of the inward work of holiness wrought by His Spirit. The Scriptures teach, what common sense con-firms, that the present, constant, and final acceptance of a sinner must be a sentence of righteousness pronounced for Christ’s sake independent of the merit of works

3. It is in the results of justification that the confusion of Roman theology is most apparent. The New Testament undoubtedly teaches that there must be in the believer a process of gradual righteousness; yet carefully distinguishes that from the one sentence of justification which is ever and continuously pronouncing the believer righteous. But the Council made no such distinction. In its doctrine justification admits, in all its meaning, of increase. Sic ergo justificati et amici Dei ac domestici facti euntes de virtute in virtutem, renovantur de die in diem, hoc est, mortificando membra carnis suae et exhibendo ea arma justitiae in sanctificationem . . . per observationem mandatorum Dei et ecclesiae in ipsa justitia per Christi gratiam accepta, co-operante fide bonis operibus, crescunt atque magis justificantur. Again, human satisfaction is superadded as a requirement for the continual impartation of forgiveness in the sacrament of penance: Si quis negaverit, ad integram et perfectam peccatorum remis-sionem requiri tres actus in poenitente, quasi materiam sacramenti poenitentiae, videlicet contritionem, confessionem et satisfactionem, quae tres poenitentiae partes dicuntur; aut dixerit, duas tantum esse poenitentiae partes, terrores scilicet incussos conscientiae agnito peccato, et fidem conceptam ex evangelio vel absolutione, qua credit quis sibi per Christum remissa peccata: anathema sit This canon omits faith, and places the satisfaction of human works in its stead: the same term being applied to the good deeds of penitent obedience that is applied to the One Meritorious Oblation of Christ which indeed is admitted to lie at the basis of all. Moreover, in the anxiety to defend faith from being made a merely blind confidence in the Atonement, on the one hand, and a personal assurance of salvation on the other, it is reduced as the instrument of salvation to mere assent; but that assent itself is among the preparations of prevenient grace. The faith quickened and informed with charity is no

other than the life of regeneration, and, in making this the faith that justifies, the renewal of the soul is really made the reason of acceptance for the sake of Christ. Not faith in the Redeemer, but the work of that faith, becomes the formal cause of justification. The danger of Antinomianism is obviated only by a fatal opposite extreme: the denial in theory that the SOLE ground of justification is the virtue of Christ, and the practical traffic in good works flowing from that denial. The truth of an advancement in holiness is maintained, with its consequent, the increase of the Divine complacency: but this justifications incrementum is, however true as an increase of righteousness, utterly unscriptural as disjoined from a settled and permanent justification of pardon. Rome, once more, rightly taught the necessity of good works in order to the continuance and perfection of a state of salvation; but condemnation was pronounced upon the doctrine that these good works are only the fructus et signa justificationis; and moreover these good works were made meritorious, enhancing the justification and the rewards of the justified in virtue of a merit that vainly sheltered itself under the sanction of the Scriptural reward of grace

III. The subsequent development of the doctrine of Rome on this doctrine is deeply interesting; but chiefly in relation to some of the other topics that will come under discussion. From Bellarmine, the first controversial defender of the Council, down to Moehler its latest, the history of variation may be profitably studied

1. Bellarmine himself introduced several important modifications; and his bolder statements tend to bring into relief a certain moderate tone that was adopted in the Council. As to faith he says: " In three things Catholics differ from heretics. First, in the Object of justifying faith, which heretics restrict to the promise of special mercy, while we would extend it as widely as the whole Word of God. Secondly, in the faculty of mind which is its seat. They place it in the will, defining it to be trust and confounding it with hope, as fiducial trust is only confirmed hope. Catholics teach that it is in the intellect

Finally, in the act of the understanding involved. They define faith by knowledge, we by assent. For we assent to God, even when He proposes things to be believed which we do not understand." To this faith of so general a nature he ascribes a sort of merit: " That it is the cause and has the power of justifying, and in some sense merits it." He distinguished more precisely than the Council between the first and the second justification: " We say that St. Paul speaks of the first justification, in which the unrighteous are made righteous; while St. James speaks of the second, in which the just is made more just. Thus the former rightly says that man is justified without works, and the latter that he is justified by works." He denies what has been abundantly proved, that both writers speak only of a declaratory justification. Bellarmine rejected altogether the imputation of Christ’s righteousness, which the Council rejected only as being the sole ground of acceptance

"Our adversaries have never found a passage in which it is stated that Christ’s righteousness is imputed to us for righteousness, or that we are righteous through the imputation of His righteousness." The Arminians said the same thing in almost the same words; but both forgot that, as to the essential matter involved, there is scarcely a shade of difference between the imputation of Christ’s righteousness and the imputation of its virtue in pardon. Finally, this controversialist laid the foundation of a more thorough exposition of the Works of Supererogation and the Counsels of Perfection, which the Council left as they were commonly understood and perverted. These points we dwell on elsewhere. Meanwhile, it is instructive to find that the great champion of the merit of

works, who said that " good works are necessary to salvation, not only in regard to their presence, but also in regard to their efficacy"—a profound and far-reaching error—was, like many other devotees of Roman doctrine, more faithful to the Atonement as a penitent Christian than he was as a polemical writer. He did not end his description of justification without a strong recommendation to simple trust in the pure mercy of God: Propter incertitudinem propriae justitiae, et periculum inanis gloriae, tutissimum est fiduciam totam in sola misericordia Dei et benignitate reponere. Hoc solum dicimus, tutius esse meritorum jam partorum qudammodo oblivisci, et in solam misericordiam Dei respicere; tum quia nemo absque revelatione certo scire potest se habere vera merita, aut in eis in finem usque perseveraturum: tum quia nihil est facilius, in hoc loco tentationis, quam superbiam ex consideratione bonorum operum gigm

2. Within the Roman Church there have been many controversies upon what are called the Doctrines of Grace. The most important was its contest with Jansenism, or Augustinian Predestinarianism, or what we call Calvinism. As Calvinism had its Arminian Five Points to oppose, so Jesuit Romanism had its Five Points of Jansenism to oppose. The Papal Constitutions or Bulls issued to suppress these doctrines merely confirmed, and in a negative way, the Decrees and Canons of Trent, which are the only authoritative formulas. The exposition, however, of these formulas has been various, and belongs to a more minute History of Doctrine. The student who would thoroughly understand the position of modern Romanism must study the controversy which Moehler’s Symbolism excited in the earlier part of this century. In the long and exhaustive discussion of Moehler every point is touched. To many of his arguments against the exaggerated doctrine of Imputation we must concede their force. But the fundamental question of the relation of faith to justification, though stated with much subtlety, is not relieved of its anti-Scriptural character as above exhibited. A few sentences will show this. " To the abstract idea of God, as a Being infinitely just, corresponds the sentiment of fear. If, on the other hand, God be conceived of as the allloving, merciful, and forgiving Father, this is most assuredly possible only by a kindred sentiment in our souls, corresponding to the Divine love, that is to say, by a love germinating within us. It is awakening love only that can embrace the loving, pardoning, compassionate God, and surrender itself up entirely to Him, as also the Redeemer saith: He that loveth Me shall be loved of My Father, and I will love him, and will manifest Myself to him. Thus it would not be faith (confidence) that would be first in the order of time, and love in the next place, but faith would be an effect of love, which, after she had engendered faith as confidence, supported by this her own self-begotten helpmate, would come forward more vigorously and efficaciously. This, at least, Holy Writ teaches very clearly: compare Romans 5:5 with 8: 15, 16. The second mode whereby what we have said may be made evident is as follows. Confidence in the Redeemer (for this, we repeat, the Reformers denominate faith) necessarily presupposes a secret, hidden desire, —a longing after Him. For our whole being, having received the impulse from God, forces and urges us to apply to ourselves what is offered through the mediation of Christ; and our deepest necessities, whereof we have attained the consciousness through His Spirit, are satisfied only in Him. But what is now this longing, this desire, other than love? Assuredly, this aspiring of our whole being towards Christ, this effort to repose in Him, to be united with Him, to find in Him only our salvation, is naught else than love. It follows, then, that love, even according to this view of things, constitutes the foundation and external condition of confidence, —nay, its very essence; for, in every external consequence, the essence is still manifested." In answer to all this, it may be noted that there is something in faith which corresponds to the terror of the law as well as to the

attraction of the Gospel: the former must come before the latter, for love casteth out fear. Faith, as the self-renouncing, self-despairing trust in Christ, does not love Him yet with the love of which He speaks in the misapplied words of His promise, I will manifest Myself to him To quote Moehler himself: " God is represented as loving men before they love Him, that is to say, as loving them without their love; whereas the Catholic Church teaches that he only who loves God is beloved of God. Hereby the free unmerited grace of God in Christ seems totally rejected, as if only through our love the love of God deserved to be acquired. What is to be said in reply to this? We must connect with the passage John 4:10 others which appear to contradict it: wherein it is expressly said that God loves only those that love Him." But there is surely a difference between the love bestowed on those in whom Divine love is already shed abroad and the love which sheds forgiveness in response to a faith which desires Christ but cannot yet love Him. One most suggestive extract shall close this allusion to modern Roman doctrine. It must be carefully studied by those who would understand the difference between St. Paul's doctrine and that of Romanists and very many who in this respect Romanize. "The Redeemer undoubtedly announces Himself to us from without (JUSTITIA NOSTRA EXTRA NOS) as He for the sake of Whose merits the forgiveness of sins is offered with the view of restoring us to communion with God. But when we have once clearly apprehended and reconquered this righteousness, which is without, then first awakes within us the feeling kindred to Divinity; we feel ourselves attracted towards Him (this is the first germ of love); we find, even in our sins, no further obstacle; we pass them by, and move consoled onward towards God in Christ (this is confidence in the Latter); and, by the progressive development of such feelings, we at last disengage ourselves from the world, and live entirely in God (JUSTITIA INTRA NOS, INHAERENS, INFUSA)." Change some of the terms, and we have here the Lutheran and our own doctrine. The " apprehension " of an external righteousness is the faith which believes in the " forgiveness of sins offered to us;" it " passes by " the " obstacle" of former guilt. When Luther used such language he was condemned

Here is the same doctrine, but with the vital omission of a conscious appropriation of the vicarious sacrifice which propitiated the Divine displeasure and propitiated the Divine love. The Atonement is robbed of one of its eternal elements: it is made only the removal of a barrier to the flow of love; in forgetfulness that it is also set forth as a propitiation in the blood of Christ to declare the Divine righteousness. The clear conception of this truth will defend the doctrine of Justification against an error which is, of all its errors, the least peculiar to Romanism

3. It may be added that the connection between the sacrament of Baptism and Justification was clearly laid down at Trent; but that also has received sundry important modifications. It was established that the only instrumental cause was the sacrament; but the very virtue of the rite as an objective assurance, corresponding with faith as assurance subjective, was taken away by the denial of the certitude of Justification: " As no pious man ought to doubt of the mercy of God, the merit of Christ, the virtue and efficacy of the sacraments, so every one, looking at himself and his own infirmity and indisposedness, may fear concerning his own grace, since no one may know with the certitude of faith, which error may not be mixed with, that he has received the grace of God." The error common to Rome and many other communions is to confound the certitude of faith in a present justification with the assurance of an eternal salvation. The Lutherans often betray here the influence of their early Predestinarianism; the Romanists betray simply the fundamental error that reduces faith to mere intellectual assent made living by love. The Calvinists

are more consistent; for they disconnect justification from the external sacrament, and make the specific assurance of it the high privilege of the Electi electorum. The following words of Hooker are remarkable, as showing how a high sacramentarian maintained the common privilege of the assurance of faith. They may well close our slight references to the Roman Catholic view of the subject generally

"Doubtless, says the Apostle (Php 3:8), I have counted all things loss, and I do judge them to be dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in Him, not having mine own righteousness, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God through faith. Whether they [the Romish divines] speak of the first or second justification, they make the essence of it a Divine quality inherent, —they make it righteousness which is in us. If it be in us, then it is ours, as our souls are ours, though we have them from God, and can hold them no longer than pleaseth Him. But the righteousness wherein we must be found, if we will be justified, is not our own; therefore we cannot be justified by any inherent quality. Christ hath merited righteousness for as many as are found in Him. In Him God findeth us, if we be faithful; for by faith, we are incorporated into Him. Then, although in ourselves we be altogether sinful and unrighteous, yet even the man which in himself is impious, full of iniquity, full of sin, him, being found in Christ through faith, and having his sin in hatred through repentance, him God beholdeth with a gracious eye, putteth away his sin by not imputing it, taketh quite away the punishment due thereunto, by pardoning it; and accepteth him in Jesus Christ, as perfectly righteous, as if he had fulfilled all that is commanded him in the law Shall I say more perfectly righteous than if himself had fulfilled the whole law? I must take heed what I say; but the Apostle saith, God made Him which knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him! Such we are in the sight of God the Father, as is the very Son of God Himself. Let it be counted folly, or phrensy, or fury, or whatsoever. It is our wisdom, and our comfort; we care for no knowledge in the world but this, —that man hath sinned, and God hath suffered; that God hath made Himself the sin of men, and that men are made the Righteousness of God."

PROTESTANT DOCTRINE The teaching of the Reformation on this subject underwent many changes and passed through many phases. It is not possible, nor is it necessary, to trace the process here. It will be enough to give the result, as shown: first, in the common protest against ancient error; secondly, in the difference gradually established between the Lutherans and the Reformed; this leading finally to the Remonstrant or Arminian mediation between them

1. The first Reformers regarded justification by faith as the central question in their gigantic assault upon corrupt Christendom: induced proximately by the abuse of Indulgences, and ultimately by the fervent study of St. Paul’s doctrine of Righteousness

They made this the starting point of all controversy, and relied upon its settlement for the removal of every abuse. Si in unum conferantur omnia scandala, tamen unus articulus de remis-sione peccatorum, quod propter Christum gratis consequamur remissionem peccatorum per fidem, tantum affert boni ut omnia incommoda obruat. Hence in the Smalkald Articles all the individual errors of Romanism are measured and estimated in their relation to this; and its restoration is regarded as the pledge of universal amendment The great points which were gradually cleared in Luther’s mind, and formulated by Melanchthon, were these: that the righteousness of Christ is the sole ground of our acceptance, and not any past, present, or future works of our own, emphasis

being laid on the future; that justification is the forgiveness of sins, which must precede love to God, being therefore forensic and not physical, an act of God for man and not an act of God in man; that faith does not itself justify, having no virtue of its own, but that it is the instrument of appropriating the merit of Christ. The following clauses from the Formula Concordise (1581) express the common doctrine of the Reformers; and at the same time condemn certain errors that had crept in among themselves: such as that of Osiander, who taught that Christ in His Divine nature is our Righteousness, He dwelling in us and His indwelling Divine righteousness being imputed to us as our own; and that of Stancarus, who regarded Christ as mediator only in His human nature, the righteousness of which is imputed to us; and that of others who began to dwell too much on the distinct imputation of Christ's active obedience. "

(1.) Our righteousness is the whole Christ according to both natures in His sole obedience, which He as God and man offered to the Father even to the most absolute death; and by it merited for us the remission of sins and eternal life

(2.) This is before God our righteousness that He remits our sins of mere grace, without any respect to past, present, or future works. He imputes to us the righteousness of the obedience of Christ; on account of that righteousness we are received by God into favor and reputed just.

(3.) Faith alone is that medium and instrument by which we apprehend Christ.

(4.) The word Justification in this Article signifies the same as being absolved from sins.

(5.) Although antecedent contrition and subsequent new obedience do not belong to the article of Justification before God, justifying faith must not be imagined to be capable of consisting with any evil purpose, such as that of continuing in sin and acting in opposition to conscience'

2. By degrees the difference between the Lutheran divines and the Reformed began to appear and take definite form

(1.) The Predestinarianism of Calvin and his followers affected at many points their doctrine of Justification as only the expression in time of an eternal decree. The distinction between Righteousness and Regeneration was maintained; but both were made to spring together from the one act of the Holy Spirit in the bestowment of the gift of faith. Hence Justification became an eternal and unchangeable act, the investiture of the regenerate, in virtue of their union with Christ, with His righteousness active and passive: passive, for the removal of the sentence of death; active, for their reinstatement in the privileges of righteousness. Justification was at once an external act (actus forensis) and the imputation of Another's righteousness (imputatio justitiae Christi). Calvin's own teaching may be summed up in two sentences: Sicut non potest discerpi Christus in partes, itainseparabiles esse haec duo, quae simul et conjunctim in Ipso percipimus, justitiam et sanctifica-tionem. But before this we read: Justificationem in peccatorum remissione ac justitiae Christi imputatione positam esse dicimus

(2.) The Lutheran divines at first tended the same way. Hollaz, for instance, betrays a certain indistinctness which long affected the dogmatic divines who took up Luther's work: Justification distinquitur in primam et continuatam. Illa est actus gratiae, quo Deus, judex justissimus et misericordissimus, homini peccatori, culpae et poenae reo sed converso et renato, ex mera misericordia propter satisfactionem et meritum Christi, vera fide apprehensum, peccata remittit et

justitiam Christi imputat, ut, in filium Dei adoptatus, haeres sit vitae aeternae. Here there is the same priority of regeneration, and the sinner is supposed to have the new life in Christ before the mercy of the Atonement is applied in the forgiveness of sins. By degrees the two correlative sides of the one justification were adopted instead: negative, in the non-imputation of guilt, corresponding with the passive obedience of Christ as having paid the penalty; positive, in the imputation of righteousness, corresponding with His active obedience as belonging to the believer in the mutual transfer of relations between the Lord and man. But these were distinguished " non secundum rem sed secundum rationem:" not as distinct in fact, but distinct only in the order of thought. Others made justification the remission of sins on the ground of a previous imputation of Christ's righteousness, which preserves one consistency at the expense of another. But, rejecting the doctrine of election, and holding a higher theory of sacramental efficacy, Lutheranism gradually departed further from Calvinism. It admitted that justification might be lost, and found again, and finally lost; that it is a state, as well as an act; and a state out of which a man may fall. It gave a more important function to good works. Denying, against the Romanists, that there can be any opera supererogationis, or merits acquired by obeying the counsels of perfection, it also denied, against the Calvinists, or rather the Antinomians, that good works have absolutely nothing to do and are not regarded in the sinner's present and final acceptance. There is a way of holding the imputation of Christ's righteousness, active and passive, which makes it very hard to give a good account of the relation of good works to salvation. There was originally and there has always been much fluctuation and much embarrassment on this subject. Antinomianism was an outgrowth of Lutheranism, and the Form. Council condemned Agricola's doctrine by establishing a triple use of the law; paedagogicus, for conversion; politicus, for society; didacticus, for the believer. And it laid down that good works are necessary, not in. the sense of being enforced, but as testimonies of the presence of the Spirit ARMINIAN OR REMONSTRANT DOCTRINE

Arminianism was in its doctrine of the Atonement a mediation between Socinianism and the Anselmic teaching as revived at the Reformation; and in that of righteousness a mediation between the later Lutherans and the Reformed. Its firm maintenance of universal redemption affected its theory of justification at all points. Generally faithful to the truth, it held some peculiarities which lead to error. But it must be remembered that Arminianism gradually declined from its first integrity; and that it does not now represent any fixed standard of confession

I. The Remonstrants held that Christ's obedience is the sole ground of justification, the only meritorious cause; that faith is the sole instrumental cause; that good works can never have any kind of merit: all this in common with the other Reformers

1. Arminius himself gives this definition: " Justification is a just and gracious act of God by which, from the throne of His grace and mercy, He absolves from his sins man, who is a sinner but who is a believer, on account of Christ, and His obedience and righteousness, and considers him righteous to the salvation of the justified person, and to the glory of Divine righteousness and grace." "The meritorious cause of justification is Christ through His obedience and righteousness . . .. He is the material cause of our justification, so far as God bestows Christ on us for righteousness, and imputes His righteousness and obedience to us. In regard to this twofold cause, the meritorious and the material, we are said to be constituted righteous through the obedience of Christ." But both Arminius and his followers declined to admit any distinction between the active and the passive obedience. In fact, they gradually denied altogether the direct

imputation of Christ's righteousness. While denying that works, whether legal or evangelical, merit salvation, they asserted that the faith which justifies is regarded by God as a fides obsequiosa or assensus fidu-cialis, a faith which includes obedience. The Remonstrant Confession says: In ipsum Christum ad salutem a Deo nobis ex pura gratia datum toti recumbimus. Itaque ad fidem veram et salvificam non sufficit sola notitia, neque assensus, sed requiritur omnino firmus et solidus voluntatisque deliberatae imperio roboratus, denique fiducialis et obsequiosus assensus. qui et fiducia dicitur. No exception can be taken to this statement, which seems to unite the best of the Lutheran and Calvinistic points. But the following words of Limboreh reveal the secret of weak-ness in the later Arminian doctrine: Sed fides est conditio in nobis et a nobis requisita, ut justificationem consequamur. Est itaque talis actus, qui licet in se spectatus perfectus nequaquam sit, sed in multis deficiens, tamen a Deo gratiosa et liberrima voluntate pro pleno et perfecto acceptatur et propter quem Deus homini gratiose remissionem peccatorum et vitas aeternae praemium conferre vult. All this is only partially true. God requires faith, but it is also His gift. He does, for Christ's sake, pardon the imperfection of the good work wrought by faith, which is faith itself; but he does not repute it as perfect so far as concerns our justification. This is the imputation of righteousness to the believer himself: not to the work of faith. The faith of the ungodly is reckoned for righteousness even before it can produce its first act

2. It would not be difficult to show that there is a strong resemblance here to the Romanist error: the faith is informed and clothed with the works of love which, though imperfect, are accepted and rewarded under the provisions of a new and reduced law of righteousness. That God does accept the righteousness which He works in us as perfect for Christ's sake is undoubtedly true, but it is not on account of this inwrought righteousness that He accepts the sanctified believer. The faith that looks at the finished work of Christ cannot rely on the finished work itself accomplished within. " An act of faith ON ACCOUNT OF WHICH, PROPTER QUEM, God graciously confers the remission of sins and the reward of eternal life" cannot be true; it is at least very inexact and dangerous language. Other extracts may be translated to make this still plainer: " It is to be remembered that, when we say we are justified by faith, we do not exclude works which faith requires and as a fruitful mother produces, but include them." " Justification is the gracious estimation or rather acceptance of our imperfect righteousness (which, if God were rigid, could not stand in His judgment) on account of Jesus Christ." All that is here said, and much more to the same effect might be added, is true of the interior righteousness which God makes and accepts, as perfect; but it has nothing to do with that supreme justification, or imputation of righteousness to the believer trusting in Christ, which precedes, which accompanies and enfolds and surrounds, and which will finally seal and accept that interior righteousness

II. The Arminian type of theology has been sometimes termed NEONOMIANISM, because of its supposed introduction of a new law, the law of grace, according to which the legal righteousness for ever impossible to man is substituted by an Evangelical Righteousness accepted of God, though imperfect, for Christ's sake. There is a method of stating this that renders it harmless. But no student of Antinomianism can fail to see how perilous is the notion that Christ has lowered the demands of the law. We are taught by St. Paul that THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF THE LAW IS TO BE FULFILLED IN US. The English Arminians who are charged with this corruption of the doctrine of justification are unjustly charged. If they assert that God accepts the imperfect obedience which believers can render in lieu of the perfect obedience required of Adam, they do not intend thereby

to assert that that obedience is the ground of their acceptance in any sense: certainly not as apart from the finished active and passive righteousness of Christ to which they look for the one justification unto life. But all such charges carry us into another doctrine: that of the Entire Sanctification or Christian Perfection which is maintained by some of them, especially the Methodists. Neonomianism, as rightly understood, is only Antinomianism in disguise

III. This leads to some brief consideration of the specific views of METHODISM, as generally classed with Arminians, in their relation to this subject. Its doctrine of justification is dependent on its doctrine of the Atonement, which it regards as an oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world

1. Generally, the Methodist teaching is that of the Anglican Article on Justification: " We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, by faith; and not for our own works or deserving," as that is followed by the Article on Good Works: " Albeit that Good Works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively Faith; insomuch that by them a lively Faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit." 2. Although Methodism lays most stress, after the example of the Apostles, on the forgiveness of sins, or the remission of their penalty, or their non-imputation, it does not, however, forget that Justification is strictly speaking more than mere forgiveness. One of its earliest statements was: " To be justified is to be pardoned and received into God's favor; into such a state that, if we continue therein, we shall be finally saved." Its Catechism thus defines: " 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 Mr. Wesley also lays the stress on Pardon: " 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 showeth forth His righteousness (or mercy) by the remission of sins that are past." But later writings of Mr. Wesley show that he was afterwards disposed to lay more stress on the positive side of justification. And some of its latest and best definitions do full justice to both. Dr. Bunting is a remarkable evidence of this: " To justify a sinner is to account and consider him relatively righteous, and to deal with him as such, notwithstanding his past actual unrighteousness; by clearing, absolving, discharging, and releasing him from various penal evils, and especially from the wrath of God, and the liability to eternal death, which, by that past unrighteousness, he had deserved, and by accepting him as just, and admitting him to the state, the privileges and the rewards of righteousness." Dr. Hannah is still more explicit, if we mark the word EMBRACE: " 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 the 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." He further says that, for the reason assigned in the last words, Justification may be considered as a stronger term than pardon or forgiveness. The merits of Christ are embraced, and the satisfaction of Christ applied, in this sound definition: explicitly connecting the merit of Christ with the faith of the penitent

3. Between this, however, and the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, especially His active righteousness, to the believer as his own, there is a great interval. Methodism has always

maintained a firm protest against the distinct imputation of the active obedience of the Substitute of man; but has been reluctant to give up altogether the thought of an imputation of Christ's righteousness generally. The following words of Mr. Wesley, confirmed by hymns which the Methodists delight to sing, will carry back this instinctive vacillation to an early period: " As the active and passive righteousness of Christ were never in fact separated from each other, so we never need separate them at all. It is with regard to these conjointly that Jesus is called ' the Lord our Righteousness/ But when is this righteousness imputed? When they believe; in that very hour the righteousness of Christ is theirs; it is imputed to everyone that believes, as soon as he believes. But in what sense is this righteousness imputed to believers? In this; all believers are forgiven and accepted, not for the sake of anything in them, or of anything that ever was, that is, or ever can be done by them, but wholly for the sake of what Christ hath done and suffered for them. But perhaps some will affirm that faith is imputed to us for righteousness. St. Paul affirms this, therefore I affirm it too. Faith is imputed for righteousness to every believer, namely, faith in the righteousness of Christ; but this is exactly the same thing which has been said before; for by that expression I mean neither more nor less than that we are justified by faith, not by works; or that every believer is forgiven and accepted merely for the sake of what Christ has done and suffered." 4. This is only the echo of the words of Goodwin: " If we take the phrase of imputing Christ's righteousness improperly, namely, for the bestowing, as it were, the righteousness of Christ, including His obedience as well passive as active in the return of it, that is, in the privileges, blessings, and benefits purchased by it, so a believer may be said to be justified by the righteousness of Christ imputed. But then the meaning can be no more than this: God justifies a believer for the sake of Christ's righteousness, and not for any righteousness of his own. Such an imputation of the righteousness of Christ as this is no way denied or questioned." Here Mr. Watson remarks: " With Calvin the notion seems to be, that the righteousness of Christ, that is, His entire obedience to the will of His Father, both in doing and suffering, is, upon our believing, imputed, or accounted to us, or accepted for us, 'as though it were our own.' From which we may conclude that he admitted some kind of transfer of the righteousness of Christ to our account; and that believers are considered so to be in Christ, as that He should answer for them in law, and plead His righteousness in default of theirs. All this, we grant, is capable of being interpreted in a good and scriptural sense; but it is also capable of a contrary one." It is the antinomian abuse that has made the doctrine suspicious. But we must be on our guard against surrendering precious truths, merely because they have been perverted. So long as we hear the Apostle's trust as to the past, I am crucified with Christ,1 and his present experience and hope for the future of being FOUND IN CHRIST, NOT HAVING MINE OWN RIGHTEOUSNESS,2 we must be cautious how we recoil from the imputation of the Righteousness of Christ. To this it must in some sense come at last; for, even when our own conformity to the law is raised to the highest perfection Heaven can demand, we must in respect to the demand of righteousness upon our whole history and character be FOUND IN CHRIST, or be lost. But the language of Scripture should be adhered to in every statement on such a subject. The inspired writers use almost every possible variation of phrase, save that the righteousness of Christ is reckoned to believers, or, in the words of the Westminster Confession, " imputing the righteousness and satisfaction of Christ unto them." However nearly the assimilation, or union, or identification with Christ, may be approached, there is a shade of interval which forbids the use of such language as is so freely used by many. This question, however, and others closely connected with it, will recur in the next sections of Administered

Redemption 1 Galatians 2:20; 2 Php 3:9

MODERN ERRORS

"There is scarcely an error concerning the sinner’s acceptance with God that has not its modern representative; nor is there a modern error the germs of which have not already been noted as traceable in antiquity

I. The older Socinianism, rejecting the Divinity and vicarious atonement of the Redeemer, regarded the Deity as a Being acting above and independently of law, and as remitting the penalties of sin on condition of faith, which is viewed as obedience. Socinus made free use of the terminology of the New Testament in his definitions, one of which well deserves study. " Faith therefore in Christ by which we are justified, although it embraces and signifies the obedience which in hope of eternal life we pay, and therefore shows itself in work, yet is opposed to works inasmuch as it does not in itself contain a perpetual and most absolute observance of Divine precepts, nor justifies by its own virtue, but on account of the clemency of God, who regards those that perform this work of faith, as Christ Himself calls it, as righteous, and in His own incomparable benignity condescends to impute to those before unjust the righteousness which He requires." Modern Unitarianism, which may be called Rationalism, holds the same general idea of the Divine toleration of man’s infirmity, and of the energy of an earnest faith in the possibility of amendment. We may see the issue in the following words of Wegscheider, a high authority: " Not by any individual good acts done, nor by any merit whatever, but only by true faith, that is, by a mind ordered after the pattern of Christ and His precepts; and thus turned to God, piously referring all its thoughts and deeds to Him and His most holy will, are men approved to God. And trusting to the Divine benevolence, which Christ in His suffering of death has wonderfully confirmed, they are filled with the hope of future blessedness to be accorded to them according to their own moral dignity." Or as another high authority, Staeudlin, says: All true amendment and every right act must spring from faith, when we understand by it the conviction that anything is right, the assurance of certain great moral and religious principles." Some of the noblest testimonies ever given to the virtue and energy and potentiality of strong faith in the good are to be found among Deists who reject that revelation of God in Christ which is to man the eternal warrant and energy of belief. But the faith to which Scripture ascribes such wonders is faith in God, with all His attributes of justice and mercy, as they have their highest manifestation in the work of Jesus

II. Within almost all the more orthodox communities of Christendom there is observable a strong partiality towards a view of justification that regards it as the expression of the Divine complacency resting on the soul in which the Incarnate Son is formed. It may indeed be said that almost every error on the subject is more or less a variation upon this

1. It is in reality the error of a certain type of teaching in Romanism and the Greek Church: so far that is, as concerns the simple doctrine of Justification itself, apart from its relations with the Sacrament of Penance. The FIDES FORMATA brings Jesus into the soul, and the growing holiness which His presence insures is the progressive justification of the believer. There are treatises in which devout Romanists have discussed the doctrine —sometimes under the very title "De Gratia Sanctificante"— in a manner almost unexceptionable, if the subject were Regeneration and Renewal, or the Inward Life of Holiness

2. It is virtually the view of all those diversified Latitudinaviaris, —within and without the Anglican Establishment, on both sides of the Atlantic, and over the Continent of Europe, save among the consistent Calvinistic or Reformed Communions, —who reject the doctrine of God reconciled to man through a propitiation. The presence of Christ in humanity is the reconciliation of the race to God according to this modern Gospel; and the ministry of reconciliation is only the announcement of a fact which all men are already interested in, or of a privilege that all men already possess. This particular error will find its more appropriate place when we look at the history of the doctrine of regeneration. Meanwhile, it is enough to mention that such a revolt against the doctrine of CHRIST FOR us, as combined with CHRIST IN US, is spreading rapidly and must be earnestly repelled. Schleiermacher's influence has given it much currency in Germany, where many otherwise orthodox theologians accept his notion that "believers are taken up into a life-fellowship with Christ, Who has introduced a new relation of man to God," omitting all reference to the new relation of God to man. But there is discernible a strong reaction in favor of the old doctrine of the Reformation, as was shown by the general condemnation with which Hengstenberg's theory of a progressive justification based upon the indwelling of love was encountered. Martensen, in his popular Dogmatics, seems to regard Justifying faith as an ethical principle: "In His merciful view God sees in the seedcorn the future fruit of salvation, in the pure will the realized idea of freedom."

3. Mysticism of every type, including those which are most Evangelical in devotion to Christ and the fruits of holiness, has been governed by this error, though in its most attractive form. The Apology of Barclay exhibits its influence on the theology of the Society of Friends; but it is wrong to class the Quakers among those who utterly reject the benefit of an external atonement. This will appear from the following quotation, which shows the good and the evil of their views: " Although we place remission of sins in the Righteousness and Obedience of Christ, performed by Him in the flesh, as to what pertains to the remote procuring cause, and that we hold ourselves formally justified by Jesus Christ formed and brought forth in us, yet can we not, as some Protestants have unwarily done, exclude works from justification. For, though properly we be not justified for them, yet we are justified in them; and they are necessary, even as causa sine qua non . . .. Though they be not meritorious, and draw no debt upon God, yet He cannot but accept and reward them. For it is contrary to His nature to deny His own; since they may be perfect in their kind, as proceeding from a pure, holy birth and root." The infection of the thought that the INDWELLING CHRIST is the formal cause of our justification pervades a large portion of the ascetic and devotional theology of all ages of the Christian Church. It cannot be doubted that the mystical union with the Savior does in much of this literature virtually include dependence on His work as an external atonement. Of that the reader must often feel quite assured. And it is only Christian charity to think that the Lord is in some cases not strict to mark the offence of narrowing unduly the Imputation and benefit of His Righteousness as an objective provision for deliverance from guilt. There are very many who in words reject the double formula of CHRIST FOR US AND CHRIST IN US, but nevertheless embrace it in fact with all their hearts. But, whether accepted or rejected, it is the final truth on the whole subject of CHRISTIAN RIGHTEOUSNESS

31. Vol 03 - Christian Sonship

Christian Sonship CHRISTIAN SONSHIP

REGENERATION:

Agent;

Nature and Definitions;

Means.

ADOPTION: The Term; The Act of God; Privilege Conferred on Man PRIVILEGES OF CHRISTIAN SONSHIP

Access to God;

Liberty;

Special Guidance of the Spirit;

Election;

Inheritance.

HISTORICAL:

Judaism;

Early Fathers;

Sacramental Theories;

Theories of Co-operation or Divine and Human Elements;

Baptismal Regeneration and Adoption; Its Order in Economy of Grace;

Relation of Christian Regeneration to the Elements of Human Nature;

Various Estimates of Regeneration THE Christian privilege of Sonship is that of filial life restored to man in and through Christ. This blessing, connecting the Mediatorial Trinity, as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, in a special manner with the new relations of the believer, may be distinguished as the internal Regeneration and the external Adoption. But, however distinct, these two are to be united when we consider the peculiar Prerogatives of the children of God viewed as His children: they are the rights of adoption conferred on such as are made capable of them by their renewal, or, in another view, the rights of regeneration which in adoption are acknowledged and bestowed

1. No terms are more strictly correlative than Regeneration and Adoption. They describe the same blessing under two aspects: the former referring to the filial character, the latter to the filial

privilege. But they are not thus closely connected as cause and effect: they are co-ordinate, and the link between them is the common Sonship. The assurance of filial adoption does not produce the regenerate life; nor does the infusion of the perfect life of regeneration of itself invest the children of God with all the prerogatives of heirship

Moreover, they are as distinct from the other leading blessings in the economy of grace as they are themselves united. The justified state does not involve of necessity the special privileges of adoption; nor does regeneration as such imply the specific relation to God which sanctification signifies The two terms we now consider embrace in their unity an entirely distinct department of the Spirit's administration of the New Covenant: they lead us into the household of faith and the family of God. Touching at many points those other departments, they are nevertheless perfect and complete in themselves

2. The privilege of Christian sonship connects the Holy Trinity in a peculiar manner with the administration of grace. If such a distinction may be allowed, it has a more direct connection than the other privileges of the covenant with the Son Incarnate. This specific blessing is in relation to righteousness and sanctification what the Son is in relation to the Father and the Holy Ghost. Among the last sayings of the Savior were these: I ascend unto My Father and your Father,1 to that Father of whom all paternity in heaven and earth is named.2 He who is the Logos to the creation generally is the Son towards the filial creation. But this special relation to the Son extends to both aspects of sonship as adoption and regeneration. We are adopted into the relation which the Son occupies eternally: hence the term which expresses this prerogative is uiothesia, where the uios is preserved as the solitary word that is ever used to signify the Son's relation to the Father

We are regenerated by the life of Christ imparted through the Spirit: hence it is paliggenesia, and we are tekna, both terms as it were reproducing in time the eternal generation. Our regeneration answers to the eternally Begotten, our adoption to the eternally Beloved 1 John 20:17; 2 Ephesians 3:15

3. There are some passages in the New Testament which unite the two; and these may be introduced as the general preface to what follows. But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God:1 exousían tékna Theoú genésthai, authority or privilege to be made into children, because they believe on the name of the Son. This is precisely the same as what is afterwards called adoption. Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God: here we have a most complete definition of regeneration. The two ideas run through the eighth chapter of the Romans; though both there, and in the Galatian epistle, it is the adoption that is more conspicuous. In St. Peter we have both. Which according to His abundant mercy hath begotten us again:2 this is regeneration; to an inheritance incorruptible denotes the adoption to which inheritance belongs as a privilege. But best of all in St. John: Behold .. that we SHOULD BE CALLED and WE ARE the sons of God.3 In this however, as in all, our Lord Himself gave the word: If the Son, therefore, shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed;4 that is, by the possession of a place among the children, and the children's freedom. If God were your Father, ye would love Me: here, as the context shows, regeneration or the possession of new life is meant 1 John 1:12; 2 1 Peter 1:3-4; 3 1 John 3:1-2; 4 John 8:36; John 8:42

REGENERATION

Regeneration is the final and decisive work wrought in the spirit and moral nature of man when the perfect principle of spiritual life in Christ Jesus is imparted by the Holy Ghost

Many and various descriptions of this fundamental change are given in Scripture: showing its relations to the several Persons of the Trinity, to the penitent faith of the recipient, to the means employed in effecting it. The best method of acquiring a clear view of the teaching of the word of God on this subject is simply to arrange and classify these descriptions

I. The Divine Agent in the new life is the Holy Trinity, Whose agency is that of generation and creation: each of these terms being respectively the centre of a circle of phrases

1. The Persons of the Sacred Trinity are Severally Agents. It is said of the Father: Of His own will begat He us with the word of truth.1 You hath He quickened.2 So God, generally, or God and the Father; Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . Who hath begotten us again!3 The Son quickeneth whom He will.4 I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly,5 perisson: the higher, deeper, fuller life which is the result of Christian regeneration, in contradistinction to the preliminary life that precedes the new birth, as well as to the imperfect privilege of the older economy. It is, however, the adoption of sonship which is more expressly ascribed to the Son: to them gave He power to become the sons of God6 by privilege who were born of God. But the Holy Ghost is the specific Agent: as the Administrator of redemption He is a quickening Spirit.7 That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is horn of the Spirit is spirit.8 There is no more exact translation of New-Testament thought into ecclesiastical phrase than that which gave the Holy Ghost the title: to Kurion to soopoion, the Giver of life 1 James 1:18; 2 Ephesians 2:1; 3 1 Peter 1:3; 4 John 5:21; 5 John 10:10; 6 John 1:12; 7 1 Corinthians 15:45; 8 John 3:6 2. The Divine operation presents three general classes of terms

(1.) Some refer to generation. The simplest is that of begetting: every one that loveth Him that begat, loveth him also that is begotten of Him,1 tón genneésanta. The idea is modified in St. Peter's begotten us again,2 anagenneésas. In one passage the mother's function is used in the original, though disguised in the translation: of His own will begat He us:3 apekúeesen, as before in ver. 15 the same peculiar verb is employed, bringeth forth death.4 These are united in the general word quickening: the Son quickeneth whom He will, zooopoieí. This is modified again: quickened us together with Christ.5 St. John's is a remarkable variation on the thought: whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin, because His seed remaineth in him.6 All these descriptions are very impressive as adopting and applying to Christians the sacred language first used of the ONLY BEGOTTEN [GOD], which is in the bosom of the Father.7(2.) Again many other terms refer to creation

St. James unites this idea with the former: begat He us . . . that we should be a kind of first-fruits of His creatures.8It is both creation, new creation, and the secondary creation of renewal, If any man be in Christ he is a new creature:9 ktísis, creation or creature. He is created in Christ Jesus unto good works. It is however a secondary creation, or reduction of the soul to order out of its chaos: by the renewing of the Holy Ghost,10 anakainoóseoos. Here we must remember the analogy of the genesis of all things at the beginning: there was an absolute creation of matter, or calling that which was not into being; and there was the subsequent fashioning of that matter into forms which

constitute the habitable Cosmos. The latter is the creator on which the Scripture most dwells: whether it regards the physical or it regards the spiritual order. Just as the sleeper is dead and the dead is only asleep, —awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead,11 —so the creation is only a renewal, while the renewal is no less than a creation. (3.) These sometimes are united. And have put on the new man, ton neon, which is renewed,12 tón anakainoúmenon. And be renewed in the spirit of your mind,13 ananeoústhai and that ye put on the new man, tón kainón ánthroopon, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness. It is well to note, without pressing too far, the distinction between the two forms, neos and kainos, and their combinations. The former refers to time: the new man is entirely different from his FORMER self. The latter refers to quality: the new man is different from his former SELF, and the idea of a great change is more marked. In these passages the creating act of God is regarded as a process issuing in the new character; as a process in which He uses the co-operation of man. But in another passage the creating idea is used rather of a definite act: for we are His workmanship,14 poíeema, created in Christ Jesus unto good works. We are saved apart from our own merit, through a new Divine energy that prepares us for works which then are good: good because they spring from a renewed nature, are performed under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and for ever renounce all claim to goodness independent of His grace

1 1 John 5:1; 2 1 Peter 1:3; 3 James 1:15; James 1:18; 4 John 5:21; 5 Ephesians 2:5; 6 1 John 3:9; 7 John 1:18; 8 James 1:18; 9 2 Corinthians 5:17; 10 Titus 3:5; 11 Ephesians 5:14; 12 Colossians 3:10; 13 Ephesians 4:23-24; 14 Ephesians 2:10

II. As wrought in man, regeneration is described in many ways: there is a greater variety of indirect and figurative definitions of this blessing than of any other in the covenant of grace

1. The terms indicating the spiritual birth take the lead. Christians are born of God,1 ek toú Theoú; they are children of God; they are born again,2 ánoothen, which is the same as from above: indeed the expression has rather a local than a temporal meaning, and is strictly from above, or from heaven, that is, born of God, according to St. John’s interpretation in the epistle. As describing regeneration it must have the preeminence, being our Lord’s own first and only formal word on the subject. When He adds: the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit,3 we are taught that the preliminary grace of the Holy Ghost has its mysterious issue in the new birth of him who has been born (ho gegenneeméno, in the perfect, the completion of a process). It is, as we have defined it, the full filial life. The word distinguishes the new product from that which is born of the flesh;4 it is a paliggenesia, and indicates the bestowment of a new life according to the original idea of man in the Divine mind 1 1 John 3:9-10; 2 John 3:3; 3 John 3:8; 4 John 3:3; John 3:6-7

2. It is a resurrection from a state of death; from death, and not merely a rising up generally from sin: as those that are alive from the dead.1 (1.) It is therefore the same man who was dead in trespasses and sins;2 and the idea seems to be that the new man is raised up within the old: to be nourished and grow while the latter dies. This follows the analogy of our Lord’s words: except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone.3 The old nature is mortified with Christ and the new rises from it. But the analogy in other respects fails. The true life of the spirit is life in death, and death unto life; but it is not the dissolution of the old nature that feeds the new germ.

(2.) Hence the stricter view of this interior new birth is that of a resurrection in the fellowship of the risen Savior, and connects it with the fellowship of His atoning death unto the condemnation of sin. In other words the new life is the counterpart of the death to the law. Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death that, like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection.4 He that is united to the Redeemer by faith, of which baptism is the sign, is justified from sin; but this cannot be without a spiritual resurrection with Him, of which the rising out of the water is the symbol, as descending into it is the symbol of the former. In this passage regeneration is regarded rather as a process following the instantaneous death: that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin.5 Hence the expression, Reckon ye also yourselves [to be] dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord. The same instantaneous life with Christ, followed by the same death in life of spiritual mortification, is taught in the Colossian epistle. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath He quickened together with Him, having forgiven you all trespasses . . .. Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth.6 (3.) Spiritual Circumcision in union with Christ is another aspect of the same truth. The uncircumcision of your flesh7 is spiritual death as contrasted with dead in your sins as the condemnation of the law. And in this fulfillment of the symbol, in the taking away the foreskins of your heart, that inward circumcision which is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter,8 we have the New-Testament antitype of a large series of Old-Testament types of the future regeneration

1 Romans 6:13; 2 Ephesians 2:1; 3 John 12:24; 4 Romans 6:4-5; Romans 6:7; 5 Romans 6:6; Romans 6:11; 6 Colossians 2:13; Colossians 3:5; 7 Jeremiah 4:4; 8 Romans 2:29

3. It is the introduction into a new world. This follows from the former: the children of this resurrection are quickened or raised into newness of life.1 They have new tastes, appetites, dispositions, senses adapted to a new state of things. If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature, old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.2 Of this change our Lord spoke when He said: except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.3 Christians, having ascended with Christ, sit in the heavenly places;4 they are required therefore to set their affection on things above.5 This aspect of the new birth conjoins it with Illumination. It is Let there be light!6 in the soul. For God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness hath shined in our hearts:7 which connects the New-Testament spiritual genesis, or palingenesis, with the natural one of the Old Testament 1 Romans 6:4; 2 2 Corinthians 5:17; 3 John 3:5; 4 Ephesians 1:20; 5 Colossians 3:2; 6 Genesis 1:3; 7 2 Corinthians 4:6

4. It is sharing, in a deeper sense than any yet referred to, the life of Christ. Our Lord at the outset of His teaching spoke of that which is born of the Spirit:1 at the close He represented regeneration as being union with Himself: I am the Vine, ye are the branches.2 Because I live ye shall live also.3 And, between these, He spoke of Himself, received by faith, as the life of the soul. Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood ye have no life in you.4 This is sometimes said to be Christ in you,5 and Christ formed in6 the nature. It is more than a federal fellowship in His death and life, such as results from faith in the common Redeemer and exhibits regeneration in some sense as a corporate blessing. It is the mystical communication of a certain Divine-human virtue of the Saviour’s being which cannot be defined in words. Thus we become partakers of the

Divine nature.7 To this referred one of those profound sayings which our Savior uttered, without interpretation, to be pondered by His people for ever: I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it MORE,8 perissón, that, like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.9

1 John 3:6; 2 John 15:5; 3 John 14:19; 4 John 6:53; 5 Colossians 1:27; 6 Galatians 4:19; 7 2 Peter 1:4; 8 Romans 6:4; 9 Hebrews 10:16

5. It is a new law established in the heart; according to the terms of the evangelical covenant: I will put My laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them.1 The law set up within is a definition of the new birth which connects it with justification that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us.2 Love is the fulfilling of the law.3 This also connects it with the Holy Spirit not only with His agency, but with His indwelling: the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus.4 1 Hebrews 10:16; 2 Romans 8:4; 3 Romans 8:10; 4 Romans 8:2

6. Lastly, regeneration is the renewal of man into the Divine image. This specific view is certainly not peculiar to St. Paul but he gives it special prominence: the new man which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him.1 A careful study of these words yields much important truth. (1.) The standard of the renewal is the original image in which man was created. At the moment of the impartation of the new life that image was restored, as is more directly affirmed in the parallel passage, which after God is created,2 ánthroopon tón katá Theón ktisthénta: the new man was once for all created anew; and the subsequent knowledge, and holiness of truth, are the end for which it was created. (2.) When St. Paul adds, where there is neither Greek nor Jew . . . but Christ is all and in all, he tells us that the new creation is specially related to Christ as the Archetype of this new image; which indeed was true of the original image that sin defaced, but is now more fully revealed. (3.) While the mysterious regenerating act was the restoration of that likeness, it is implied that the renewal, for this is the term, is a process ever going on towards completion. The pristine image was by one offence marred; but by many successive stages is it entirely restored. We all with open face beholding (or receiving) as in a glass the glory of the Lord are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.3 Thus the new image is gradually retrieved; the Holy Ghost is filling up and deepening the outline continually; and the regenerate life, like righteousness and sanctification, has its issue in perfection As the one regeneration leads to a continuous renewal, so the one image re-engraven leads to a continuous transformation: be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind.4 (4.) Once more, and this is of great moment, the object of this change, or the subject of this renewal, is the whole spiritual nature of man. Not his body; for its regeneration will be its resurrection: the body is (and remains) dead because of sin,5 and must undergo its penalty. Doomed as it is to dissolution it must be presented in ceaseless oblation as the instrument of the spirit which is life because of righteousness, laid on the altar of service for the present and of hope for the future. But the spirit as the seat of reason, or the immortal principle in man, and the soul, as the same spirit linked with the phenomenal world by the body, are, in all their complex faculties which are a unity in diversity, brought under the regenerating power of the Holy Ghost. We read that the natural man, Psuchikós dé ánthroopos, receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God:6 that is, the man whose spirit is subdued to the animal soul, soulish, having not the Spirit.7 But this does not signify that the soul itself, apart from the spirit, is the only defaulter: the spirit also is in the transgression; and the regenerate man becomes ho dé Pneumatikós, he that is spiritual,8 only

through his spirit being inhabited by the Spirit Divine. Neither is the soul without the spirit, nor the spirit without the soul, the seat of sin or the subject of regeneration. It is man who is renewed. (5.) Lastly, regeneration is therefore not the removal of anything infused by sin into the essence of the spirit or soul. It is not said that we receive a new nature: though no language is more common than this, it must be very carefully restricted and guarded. Partakers of the Divine nature9 we are; but as received into our own nature renewed. The heart is the man, the self; and the promise is, a new heart also will I give you.10

1 Colossians 3:10-11; 2 Ephesians 4:24; 3 2 Corinthians 3:18; 4 Romans 12:2; 5 Romans 8:10; 6 1 Corinthians 2:14; 7 Jude 1:19; 8 1 Corinthians 2:15; 9 2 Peter 1:4; 10 Ezekiel 36:26

7. We cannot review these various aspects of the new life without being impressed with the feeling that it is in some sense the central blessing of the Christian covenant

Justification is unto life, and this life is devoted to God in sanctification. But the life, as the life is in Jesus, is the unity of all. I am the Way, the Truth, and THE LIFE.1 The last book of the New Testament tells us that all its teaching concentres in the Word of Life,2 perí toú Lógou teés Zooeés: The testimony revolves again in its final accents: this is the true God and eternal life, words which closely follow St. John's last and most striking summary of the entire doctrine of the new birth. Whosoever is born of God,3 ho gegenneeménos ek toú Theoú, is he that is be-gotten of God, ho genneetheís ek toú Theoú; he sinneth not but keepeth himself: the whole world around him lieth in the Wicked One; but he, or rather we, are in Him that is true, even IN HIS SON JESUS CHRIST

Thus the Bible closes with all the elements of the doc-trine of Regeneration. It is the Divine begetting of the filial life of Christ in us: thus it is once for all. It is the progressive life which regarded in its perfected ideal cannot sin: thus it is the renewal into a finished birth. And it is that very eternal life which, begun on earth, will be consummated in heaven 1 John 14:6; 2 1 John 1:1; 3 1 John 5:18-20

III. Regeneration is described with reference to the means employed in the economy of grace. The Divine act is always represented in connection with instrumentality. God begets by the word of truth; our Lord gives His life, and not only sustains it, in the eating and drinking of Himself; the Holy Spirit instrumentally regenerates through the ordinance or sacrament of baptism. These points we need only now indicate briefly: they will be more fully discussed when we reach the Means of Grace and the Sacraments 1. The Word of God is the instrument and power of regeneration

(1.) Not as the absolute authoritative voice which calls into new life, but as the truth which is applied to the understanding and to the feelings, and through them to the will. It is the word of conviction or reproof in the preliminary process: the reproof in the understanding which enforces on the sinner the Lord's word Ye must be born again,1 which excites in the heart a profound sense of need and desire for the true life of the soul, and thus prepares the spirit, unregenerate as yet, but animated by the preliminary life of repentance, for the full power of regeneration. This influence of the truth is sometimes regarded as a fruit of the new birth: it is really a preparation for it

1 John 3:7

(2.) It is the instrument, further, as it is the vehicle of the presentation of the Savior Himself, the Truth, the supreme Object of trust. Embraced by the faith which is at once the last act of the unregenerate and the first act of the regenerate soul, He becomes the Life as well as the Truth. Of the word which offers and conveys the quickening Lord it is said by St. Peter that it is the incorruptible seed;1 though St. John means more by a seed of God that remaineth in2 the human spirit. In St. James it is the engrafted word:3 where we have a remarkable variation on the ordinary language of Scripture. Not we are engrafted into the Vine; but the Vine is engrafted into us: rather the Divine word with its doctrine is inserted into the nature for regeneration 1 1 Peter 1:23; 2 1 John 3:9; 3 James 1:21

(3.) But, more generally still, it is the Word of God which is the instrument of every Divine operation in the human heart: man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.1 The word is His sovereign and gracious will. As it is not the bread which sustains the life, but the Divine virtue of the bread, so it is not the preaching or the sacrament but the Divine virtue in both which imparts the life Every energy of God from heaven at last goes back to His word

1 Matthew 4:4

2. Baptism, also, as the sacrament of the new birth, or rather of the soul's entrance into Christ, gives regeneration both a special name and a special character. The baptism with the Holy Ghost1 is one of its definitions. The rite is the washing of regeneration,2 loutron, the bath. It is the symbol of the putting away of sin, and in this is like its precursor, circumcision. This latter symbolized by the cutting off a portion of the natural body the destruction of the body of sin.3 Baptism, a gentler rite, symbolizes the entrance into Christ, in His death and life: not the washing away of sin only, which refers to its relation to justification or forgiveness. It is the pledge of the gift of regeneration, abiding in the church: the symbolical laver which for ever assures of the invisible flowing of the Fountain opened for sin and for uncleanness.4 So long as the evangelical loutron is in the Christian sanctuary, so long is there regeneration for all its members. It also seals it to the believer, whether as a gift already imparted, as given in conjunction with the rite, or to be fully given hereafter. Its close connection with the blessing of which it is the sacramental symbol is exhibited throughout the New Testament: from our Lord's words, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God,5 which must not be emptied of their meaning, through the teaching and practice of the Acts of the Apostles, down to St. Paul's last words to Titus already quoted. The water in the doctrine of Christ becomes the laver in the Apostle's teaching 1 Matthew 3:11; 2 Titus 3:5; 3 Romans 6:6; 4 Zechariah 13:1; 5 John 3:1

ADOPTION

Adoption is the term occasionally used to signify the Divine declaratory act by which those who are accepted in Christ are reinstated in the privileges of forfeited sonship for the sake of the Incarnate Son. It is used also of the state to which these privileges belong

I. The term is used only by St. Paul, It was perhaps taken into the Christian vocabulary from the Roman law. Cum in alienam familiam inque liberorum locum extranei sumuntur, aut per praetorem fit, aut per populum. Quod per praetorem fit ADOPTIO dicitur; quod per populum ARROGATIO. If the new son was received from under the authority of his natural parent the act was Adoption; if one who was his own master was adopted it was Arrogation. The Greek term, uiothesia, is

explained by Hesychius: ou phusei alla Thesei. St. Paul uses it with three applications. First, of the Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption,1 that is, the special election among the nations. Secondly, of the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus:2 that we might receive the adoption of sons3 unto which we were predestinated.4 Finally, of the full manifestation of the children of God in their perfect investiture with all their privileges: waiting for the adoption.5 This corresponds with the final regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of His glory:6 a remarkable instance of the true relation between the terms regeneration and adoption. Both are used of the final restitution of all things, and both regard that restitution as being chiefly the restoration of man to his original and lost estate 1 Romans 9:4; 2 Galatians 3:26; 3 Galatians 4:5; 4 Ephesians 1:5; 5 Romans 8:23; 6 Matthew 19:28

II. As to the thing signified it may be regarded first as the act of God, and then as conferred on man: the Divine declaration and its human result

1. Adoption is connected with the Triune God. (1.) It is the Father who adopts into His own household: of Whom the whole family—all paternity or race relation—in heaven and earth is named.1 (2.) But it has special reference to the Son: it is in union with Him, the Son, that we become sons; we are adopted into the house by Christ, the Son over His own house,2 who imparts to us as His brethren a share in His own prerogative: if the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.3 (3.) It is declared and attested by the Holy Ghost: the Spirit of adoption.4 It is administered to faith, as the common faith which saves but as having in this case its specific object: the promise, that is, of the higher covenant, I will be a Father unto you.5 Not that the penitent sinner in coming to God regards every special blessing he needs as the object of trust. His faith is but one, and directed to one object; nor does he at the first make any distinction; afterwards, however, when he comes to understand his privileges, he learns to direct his confidence towards God under several aspects. And this, that He is a Father, is one that can never be forgotten. The seal of this faith is the testimony of the Spirit who beareth witness with our spirit—not to our spirit, but with it and through it—that we are the children of God.6 1 Ephesians 3:15; 2 Hebrews 3:6; 3 John 8:36; 4 Romans 8:15; 5 2 Corinthians 6:18; 6 Romans 8:16

2. As received by man, adoption defines the peculiarity of the filial relation as a sonship restored in respect to its privileges

(1.) It is not the sonship of creation which is signified. The angels are the sons of God;1 as also those who bear authority among men: I have said, ye are gods; and all of you are children of the Most High.2 The human race in its origin received this designation: Adam, which was the Son of God.3 Hence the prodigal son is still a son. Even after the moral image departed the natural image remained; the original prerogative can never be entirely taken away. For this my son was dead and is alive again:4 language put into the lips of an earthly father, but most assuredly only as the human echo of a Divine feeling 1 Job 1:6; 2 Psalms 82:6; 3 Luke 3:38; 4 Luke 15:24

(2.) Nor is it the sonship of likeness: in the Hebrew idiom we read of the children of light and children of this world,1 and of the wicked our Lord said with that meaning only: ye are of your father, the devil.2 In the sense of conformity with His will, and followers of His example, Christ exhorts us to walk worthy of our filial relation: that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven.3 And we are predestinated to be conformed to the image of HisSong of Solomon 4:1-16 The relation of sons, however, precedes the conformity 1 Luke 16:8; 2 John 8:44; 3 Matthew 5:45;

4 Romans 8:29

(3.) But it is the restoration of prodigals to the household of God, and maybe regarded in two lights: first, being a simple reinstatement in the original position of children of the creating Father; and, secondly, it is altogether a new endowment, being an investiture with the special prerogatives of brethren of Jesus, the Firstborn among many brethren.1 This distinction, however, is not often to be observed. The new relation of sonship by adoption has indeed revealed more fully the primary and inextinguishable Fatherhood of God, but that is scarcely remembered by reason of the new glory of His Fatherhood in Christ

1 Romans 8:15 THE PRIVILEGES OF CHRISTIAN SONSHIP The privileges of entrance into the family of God by adoption—which as privileges are connected rather with adoption than regeneration—are distinctly exhibited in the New Testament. They are filial access in the confidence of devotion : freedom from all kinds of bondage; the advantages of the election; the assurance of a constant guidance and direction of the Holy Spirit; and the enjoyment, first in earnest, and then finally, of the Christian inheritance. These all of course have relation to the other blessings of the new Covenant so far as these blessings are one in their diversity; but they are specially connected with the Christian Sonship

I. Access to God in filial confidence is the first prerogative. Ye have received the Spirit of adoption in Whom we cry, Abba, Father.1 This is the secret of all Christian devotion and worship. The temple which our High Priest has consecrated is always the house of God : the house with a meaning unknown to the ancient economy, one in which the worshippers worship as children. After quoting the declaration, I will be their God,2 St Paul adds another passage from another place, and will be a Father unto you.3 This addition is a very striking instance of the change which Christianity has introduced in the relations of His people to God. Of Solomon it had been said: 1 will be his Father, and he shall be MySong of Solomon 4:1-16 and again, I have chosen him to be My son, and I will be his Father.5 The Apostle extends this special privilege to all believers in Christ; an extension of which a distant hint had been given: bring My sons from far and My daughters from the ends of the earth,6 where St. Paul found the sanction of the inclusion of the daughters. Our Father!7 is the new invocation. This impresses its character on worship, public and private; and on all the communion of the soul with heaven. Christian fellowship with God is filial in and through His Son. It is assured confidence in Him as a Father

1 Romans 8:15; 2 Exodus 29:45; 3 2 Corinthians 6:16; 2 Corinthians 6:18; 4 2 Samuel 7:14; 5 1 Chronicles 28:6; 6 Isaiah 43:6; 7 Matthew 6:9

II. Whatsoever belongs to Liberty or Freedom, in the New-Testament sense of the word, is linked with sonship. The Savior said, the truth shall make you free;1 and then declared that the sons in the house, made free by the Son, are free indeed, eleutheroósee óntoos eleúthero: with an emphasis on the ontoos which meant more than the contrast with Jewish delusive freedom, the deep word being left, like many others, to be interpreted by the Spirit and to be understood by the meditation of faith. We are redeemed from under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.2 Between son-ship and bondage there is no affinity. The law has become a law of liberty.3 It is written in the heart, and obedience must spring from filial love. The Christian privilege is thus contrasted with that of the Jews, who were under the law and knew not the great redemption: though the ancient people were one collective Son, they were as such under tutors and

governors4 in an estate of discipline which differeth nothing from a servant, that is, until the time appointed of the Father. In itself it is emancipation from every yoke: we are not under the law but under grace.5 Grace is the new law, working by faith through love an obedience which is acceptable to God. Here justification and adoption join: the former is a perpetual sentence of release from the condemning law, the latter guarantees the strength of a new and better obedience. But, as compared with the great future, there is still a bondage to corruption, so far as the body is concerned and its infirmities. Waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body:6 the resurrection will bring in perfected freedom 1 John 8:32; John 8:36; 2 Galatians 4:5; 3 James 1:25; 4 Galatians 4:1-2; 5 Romans 6:14; 6 Romans 8:23

III. The privileges of the Election of God belong to the filial relation which is sealed by admission into the ark of the Christian family. Israel was the chosen people, to whom pertaineth the adoption,1 in St. Paul's eyes even yet untaken away; their election and their adoption were one and the same prerogative. In Christianity the election is still synonymous with adoption, but it is personal and not national: rather it is both; for the elect are the foreknown brethren of Christ and family of God glorified in eternity, even as they are one by one gathered out of the world into the Divine household through their obedience to the evangelical call. The Father has predestinated us unto the adoption of children,2 which is, being interpreted elsewhere, to be conformed to the image of HisSong of Solomon 3:1-11 God's children as such are elected out of the world; they are, like their Elder Brother, and for His sake, chosen of God and precious,4 and are unspeakably dear to their heavenly Father, Who orders everything for their welfare: all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose.5 Their highest prerogative as separated from the mass is that they are accepted in the Beloved6 or found in Him,7 and regarded with the same complacency which rests upon their Head: Mine Elect in whom My soul delighteth.8 Jesus is our Election as well as our Righteousness and our Sanctification: The Father hath chosen us in Him,9 and our election is no more and nothing less than our union with the Redeemer

1 Romans 9:4; 2 Ephesians 1:5; 3 Romans 8:29; 4 1 Peter 2:4; 5 Romans 8:28; 6 Ephesians 1:6; 7 Php 3:9; 8 Isaiah 42:1; 9 Ephesians 1:4

IV. Another special prerogative of the adoption is the personal and never-failing direction and guidance of the Holy Spirit. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God:1 this may be regarded as meaning, conversely, they that are the sons of God are led by the Spirit. He who testifies within them that they are children is given to them as a never-absent Guide: their religion is a life, a walk, a conversation in the Spirit.2 They walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.3 What the following of Christ is in the gospels, the following of the Holy Ghost is in the epistles. He is at all points, under all circumstances, and in the whole economy of life down to its minutest detail, the Monitor of the children of God. And this He is to them as they are children. Everywhere in the New Testament this special direction is promised to Christians as the adopted sons of the Father. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God;4 but ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things.5 St. John makes the promise to the Apostles extend to all the little children: submitting to His teaching, with perfect renunciation of carnal wisdom, they are led into all truth,6 at least as the truth is in Jesus.7 It is of the adopted children that St. Paul says: the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities; for we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Spirit Itself maketh intercession for us . . . according to the will of God.8 He is

in us as the Spirit of regeneration; our regenerate nature itself cries unto God; but it is the Spirit of our adoption Who beareth witness with our spirit9 of regeneration, in this sense also the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.10 It is impossible to exaggerate the blessedness of this interior and exterior guidance of the Holy Ghost given to the children of God. He is literally to them all and more than all the present Savior was to His disciples

He that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit,11 Who, common to Jesus and His brethren, is the everpresent Finger of God directing and Power of God defending the followers of Christ

1 Romans 8:14; 2 Galatians 5:25; 3 Romans 8:4; 4 1 Corinthians 2:14; 5 1 John 2:20; 1 John 2:18; 1 John 2:28; 6 John 16:13; 7 Ephesians 4:21; 8 Romans 8:26-27; 9 Romans 8:16; 10 Matthew 10:20; 11 1 Corinthians 6:17

V. The inheritance to which Christians are called is the last privilege of their adoption. Of God's ancient children-people it was said: I loved him, and called My son out of Egypt;1 that is, from the land of bondage. Moreover: saying, unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance.2 And they were in all respects types: in their redemption from Egypt, in their journey to Canaan, and in their possession of the promised land 1 Hosea 11:1; 2 Psalms 105:11

1. The Christian inheritance belongs to the children of God in a twofold sense. And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ.1 (1.) Sin condemned and disinherited man: justification removes the condemnation, and adoption restores the inheritance. That inheritance is the abundance of the privileges of the covenant: it is the whole fullness of the promises; but especially it is God Himself. The enjoyment of the Supreme Source of blessedness is the supreme good of the soul. (2.) Hence, that most sacred and eternal inheritance which the Son hath in the Father is in some as yet unknown sense shared by us. Our heirship in God is no other than our joint heirship of God with Christ. The only allusion to the eternal decree of man's salvation is that we are predestinated to be conformed to the image of HisSong of Solomon 2:1-17 This conformation, which is also transformation, is our eternal blessedness: it allows nothing beyond, for it is the perfection of man in the perfection of God. Now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when itshall appear, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is.3 The utmost and highest hope of Christianity is derived from its privilege of sonship. As for me, I will behold Thy face in righteousness.4 Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.5 It is not however the justification of the former passage, nor the sanctification of the latter, but the adopted sonship which cries: 1 shall be satisfied when I awake with Thy likeness!6 1 Romans 8:17; 2 Romans 8:29; 3 1 John 3:2; 4 Psalms 17:15; 5 Matthew 5:8; 6 Psalms 17:15

2. They enter into an heritage of which they have now only an earnest. The inheritance of Christians is in its deepest meaning reserved in heaven.1 Under whatever aspect it is viewed the Christian heritage is enjoyed only in its firstfruits. This is declared by St Paul: ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption, of the purchased possession.2 When Christ shall claim us as His possession we shall claim Him as ours, in Whom also we have become an inheritance. 3 It is after speaking of the Christian inheritance that the epistle to the Hebrews says: for we are made partakers of Christ if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end.4 1 1 Peter 1:4; 2 Ephesians 1:13-14; 3 Ephesians 1:11; 4 Hebrews 3:14

3. That participation awaits the believer: we are waiting for the adoption,1 which will change our body of humiliation, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body;2 and will enable us in our integrity of body and spirit to appear with Him in glory.3 The death of the Testator4 has put us in possession of a portion of the goods that fall to us under His covenant-testament. But we must die ourselves to enter upon the vast remainder. Then will He at the last great distribution say to every one of His brethren: all that I have is thine!5 It is He who closes the New Testament with the promise of the filial inheritance: he that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God and he shall be MySong of Solomon 6:1-13 Thus does the new covenant echo at its close the final promise of the old: and they shall be Mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up My jewels; and I will spare them as a man spareth his own son that serveth him.7 1 Romans 8:23; 2 Php 3:21; 3 Colossians 3:4; 4 Hebrews 9:16; 5 Luke 15:31; 6 Revelation 21:7; 7 Malachi 3:17

HISTORICAL The variations in opinion on this general subject may be class under these heads: the various theories of the relation of the new birth to the sacrament of baptism; differences as to the measure of human co-operation admitted; its place in the Ordo Salutis, or plan of salvation; its effect upon the various constituent elements of human nature; and its value as a Divine gift in respect to the other blessings of the Christian covenant

I. A certain theory of Baptismal Regeneration appears in the first ages of the Church, which seems in some measure to have merged the internal regeneration into the external adoption

1. The first question will be considered again more fully when we reach the doctrine of the Sacraments; a brief statement, rather historical than polemic, is however necessary here also (1.) This was probably one out of many results of Jewish influence on Christian thought

During the interval between the Old and New Testaments the converts to Judaism were said to be born again: "a convert is like a newborn child." As to his new position he was called a Proselyte: either of the Gate, as admitted to civil privileges and a place in the Court of the Gentiles; or of Righteousness, as circumcised and baptized and bound to the whole law. The term therefore answered to the Christian Adoption. So Maimonides: " The Gentile that is made a proselyte, and the servant that is made free, behold, he is like a child new born. And, as to all those relations he had whilst either Gentile or servant, they now cease." But there was in Judaism no other regeneration than that of this external adoption

(2.) Early Patristic literature similarly fell into a vague style of connecting the two. It represented the new birth as a translation into the Christian estate, an initiation by baptism into the Christian mysteries. The internal renewing process was faithfully taught; but was not connected always with the scriptural term: in fact, regeneration was equivalent to adoption simply. The new life was spoken of as renewal or renovation; and thus adoption, instead of being a concomitant of the new birth, was its precursor. The Regeneration was understood in the same broader meaning which our Savior gave it when He spoke of the final restitution of all things; only that in their view this regeneration was simply the establishment of the new order of Christianity

(3.) In this sense baptismal regeneration has been understood by very many advocates of infant baptism in every period. They use the term with a larger meaning than it generally bears: as the external estate out of which the new birth grows. Baptismal regeneration accordingly is, in the case of children, baptismal adoption, as baptism undeniably seals to the children of Christian

parents their place in the family of God; it is also a seal or pledge of a regenerating grace awaiting all Christian children duly baptized, the pledge being the preliminary grace that rests upon them and prompts to personal dedication in due time when that pledge can be by themselves redeemed

2. In a stricter sense the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is held by the larger part of Christendom: that, namely, which holds the sacraments to be the preeminent and proper Means of Grace. The Roman Catholic, Oriental, Lutheran, and Anglican communions, though in varying language, hold that regeneration is generally connected with baptism as its instrument. The Lutheran Augsburg Confession says: De baptismo docent, quod sit necessarius ad salutem. And what this necessity means is taught by Luther’s Catechism: Baptismus operatur remissionem peccatorum, liberat a morte. The English Article xxvii gives its sentiment thus: " But it is also a sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the church: the promises of forgiveness of sins, and of our adoption to be the sons of God, are visibly signed and sealed." Here it is obvious that a certain distinction is made between regeneration, of which baptism is the sign, and adoption, of which it is the instrument The Westminster Confession declares the same; with both a needful and a needless qualification. " Although it be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated. The efficacy of baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered; yet, notwithstanding, by the right use of this ordinance, the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God’s own will, in His appointed time." In these weighty words the regeneration of infants in baptism is clearly asserted to be possible, and, in the case of the elect, certain. But the addition of the words " not tied to that moment," and " in His own appointed time," may seem to allow that the full regeneration is reserved for the period when the infant shall be capable of receiving the gift

3. By many the regeneration of the soul is regarded as sacra-mentally pledged and promised in virtue of the general grace bestowed upon mankind in redemption. Baptism is therefore a sign of the blessing into which preliminary grace is to mature; and the seal of its bestowment if that preliminary grace is used aright. It should be remembered that in this scheme regeneration stands connected with all the blessings of the Christian covenant, as in the sentences quoted from the formularies above. Baptism is not more intimately allied with the new birth than with remission of sins and sanctification to God

There is, according to the Nicene Confession, " one baptism for the remission of sins," that is, one baptism unto pardon, regeneration, sanctification, and all the benefits of our Lord’s passion. Children baptized are externally pardoned, adopted, and made holy: the internal reality corresponding with these is sealed to them by the preliminary grace that belongs to the family of redeemed man, and especially to the children of the household of faith. Baptism in this doctrine, which carefully stated is irrefragable, is the sign and seal and instrument to adult believers of their pardon and renewal and sanctification. To the children of believers it is the sign and seal and instrument of imparting these blessings so far as they are capable of them: original guilt is removed, the bias to evil is counteracted by initial grace, and adoption into the household of faith is absolutely conferred. If what may be loosely called the germ of grace is regeneration in the infant, then it becomes new birth in the adult

4. The strict systematic dogma of the two mysteries which makes baptism the sacrament of birth, and the eucharist the sacrament of nourishment, may have some measure of truth in it so far as the word means the sacramental emblem. But it must not be forgotten that our Lord speaks of the sacramental eating and drinking of Himself as connected with regeneration. If the words of St. John's Gospel are referred to the Lord's Supper then we have a eucharistic regeneration as well as a baptismal: Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you: it is not, ye have no abiding life.1

1 John 6:53 II. The measure of human co-operation has been much contested

1. Extreme Calvinism holds that the life of regeneration is given by an act of as absolute sovereign power as that which gave physical existence: therefore, as there are undeniably some stirrings of spiritual life in penitents, and the beginnings of tendency to life even before true repentance, these are all regarded as evidences of renewal, and regeneration is placed before all other blessings of the Spirit. Man in this theory is purely passive. This doctrine effaces preliminary grace, so far as that grace tends to spiritual activity: such grace is preliminary no longer, but the very regeneration itself. It forgets that wherever the human will is a factor, there can be no pure passivity; and that the actual state of the soul in which it is passive under the regenerating power of the Spirit is itself produced by a self-surrendering faith of the penitent desire

2. Pelagianism, at the opposite extreme, reduced the great change to an act of the human will: as it is always in man's power to choose, and act accordingly, he really may regenerate himself by fixing his purpose fully on the Good. Semi-Pelagianism admitted that the first conversion requires Divine power, but claimed that the human will in its freedom is that power itself; and as to the regeneration of the soul it has always regarded that as the Divine blessing on human determination. But this dogma in every form lowers grace to external teaching and inducements: nature itself is in a sense grace, and the operation of the Holy Ghost effects nothing that the human will does not under His influence itself accomplish. The error in every Semi-Pelagian theory is that of forgetting that the Holy Spirit always ends, even as He always begins, the work of goodness in man without human concurrence. He begins before co-operation joins Him; and cooperation must cease at the crisis where He finishes the work

3 Synergism in the Lutheran church differed little from the latter; but its esteem of the sacramental blessing of baptism gave Divine grace its full honor in relation to baptized children. Arminianism in its doctrine of universal prevenient grace carries back the Synergism, or co-operation between God and man, to the nature behind and before baptism. In certain American schemes, which represent regeneration as the right ultimate choice of the soul, there are some errors to be noted. (1.) This choice is a conviction and desire before regeneration, and may be called conversion; or, in its higher form of entire consecration of the will, it is a fruit of renewal. It cannot be regeneration itself. (2.) The state of the soul before God is more than merely its present will and act or exercise: it has a disposition or character underlying this with which the new birth has most to do. (3.) Therefore, in common with almost all errors on this subject, these Semi-Pelagian rather than Arminian theories imply a failure to distinguish between the preliminary grace of life and the life of regeneration

III. Regeneration is sometimes erroneously placed first in the order of the bestowment of Gospel privileges. The release of the sinner from condemnation must take precedence, his new life then

begins in its fullness, and that life is consecrated to God in sanctification But in many confessions regeneration takes the lead, and this doctrine is maintained in various forms by parties fundamentally differing as to the nature of the blessing itself

1. All advocates of sacramental regeneration ex opere operato hold this opinion, at least in the case of infants baptized. Generally, a distinction is established between the regeneration which confers at the outset a germ of spiritual life and the renewal which goes on, with varying and sometimes very irregular processes, to the end. Conversion, on that scheme, is placed after regeneration, which is reduced in its significance to the infusion of a principle of grace neutralizing, or rather contending with, the vice of nature; and, when fall from grace makes it needful, counteracting original sin as a principle of concupiscence

2. The Latitudinarians who believe in the regeneration of mankind in Christ, and allow no subsequent regeneration as necessary, of course entertain the same notion. By some it is so far modified as to admit a difference, so to speak, between the regeneration that imparts to all the first germ of life, and the new birth or the full consummation of that life. The error of this system, in its best forms, is simply its effacing the distinction between the universal grace which is unto life and life itself. Its sufficient refutation is that one saying: If any man be in Christ he is a new creature.1 1 2 Corinthians 5:17

3. This order is quite essential to Calvinism, which allows of no life in the soul of man other than regenerate life, and makes regeneration the precursor of conviction, repentance, faith, and conversion. The first spark of sovereign grace decides all: that once kindled introduces the rest, and can never be extinguished

4. Calvinism and Sacramentarianism and Latitudinarianism strangely agree, therefore, in denying the possibility of the repetition of regeneration. It is certainly true that the New Testament speaks of one washing of the man who needeth not save to wash his feet;1 also that it declares the impossibility of renewal unto repentance,2 in the case of certain apostates, though not of renewal generally; also that it describes the extinction of the Spirit’s life as very difficult. The renewal of regenerate life, however, is never absolutely denied. The theory of the Gospel as laid down by our Lord Himself indicates one regeneration and constant renewal unto its perfection as a full birth of God. But the infinite grace of the new covenant is not bound to that one theory: the high ideal is not to be rigorously pressed 1 John 8:10; 2 Hebrews 6:6

IV. It is important to notice the many views which are held by philosophic theologians as to the relation of the new birth to the constitution of human nature. This is literally an illimitable subject in itself, though limited in regard to the present question. The true principles of the question are simple

1. Regeneration is the restored life of the whole nature of man: it is a new heart, the heart being the soul or self, including though distinct from the mind, the affections and the will

These three are one in human nature, and in regeneration, which, in its full meaning, is a new creation or a renewal of the inmost personality

2. It is not a change in the substance of the soul, nor in its individual acts; but in the bias towards evil which is the character. That bias, however, is not destroyed though it is arrested and made

subordinate. In perfect regeneration, which is equivalent in another region of thought to entire sanctification, that bias is utterly suppressed and destroyed

3. Hence there is in regeneration no distinction between the spirit and the soul, between the pneuma and the psuch. The regenerate is spiritual, inasmuch as the Holy Ghost reigns in his spirit: not because by the impartation of the Holy Ghost he has acquired that element, or even attained to the supremacy of the spirit in his nature. Both these are true in the popular and figurative speech of Scripture, which sometimes speaks as if the spirit in man is latent until possessed by the Divine Spirit, and as if the unregenerate spirit is no better than an animal soul. But the development of this view into a theory of human nature as unrenewed and renewed leads to great confusion

V. Lastly, divergences in regard to the value of regeneration as a principle of new life have been more or less anticipated

1. The lowest degree is that assigned by those who regard it as the merely being born into a condition or constitution of things. Against this virtual annihilation of the specific gift of the new birth enough has already been said; too much, however, cannot be urged in opposition to a notion which limits the high estate of regeneration to a blessing unconsciously received. All men are born into the new constitution of grace; multitudes of Christian children are baptized into it. But regeneration is more than this universal blessing of redemption 2. Next comes the opinion of those who make it the mere infusion of a germ, so slight that (1) it can scarcely be distinguished from the universal preliminary life that is the gift of redemption, and

(2) it is utterly inconsistent with the high views of the ascendency of the regenerate life which Scripture teaches. The lowest doctrine sanctioned by the Word of God includes freedom from the law of sin and death

3. Some descriptions of this blessing pitch it in so high a strain as to be utterly inconsistent with the common facts of experience. St. John and St. Paul must be reconciled in the true doctrine of regeneration, even as St. Paul and St. James in the true doctrine of justification. St. Paul speaks of a conflict between the flesh and the Spirit, which are contrary the one to the other1 in the ordinary regenerate estate; St. John declares that the ideal and perfect new birth, or being born of God,2 is inconsistent with sin, it cannot sin. The one Apostle refers to regeneration in its earlier stages; the other to its perfection. But neither of them denies that a child of God may relapse into sin and need forgiveness. And St. John’s sublime doctrine in this text must be harmonized with that of St. Paul, as well as with his own words:

If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father.3 1 Galatians 5:17; 2 1 John 3:9; 3 1 John 2:1

32. Vol 03 - Christian Sanctification

Christian Sanctification CHRISTIAN SANCTIFICATION IN PRINCIPLE AND PROCESS:

Purification, Consecration, Holiness PROGRESSIVE AND PERFECT Progressive in Every Aspect.

ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION Purification from Indwelling Sin:

Entire Consecration or Perfect Love;

Christian Perfection.

HISTORICAL Theories of Christian Perfection; The Early Church;

Fanatical and Ascetic;

Pelagian;

Mystical;

Romanist;

Calvinist;

Arminian;

Methodist A very extensive class of terms—perhaps the most extensive—exhibits the Christian estate as one of consecration to God. This entire range of phraseology has been transferred from the ancient temple service to the use of the new temple or church. It embraces all aspects of the Christian privilege as one of dedication to God, whether the dedication be external or internal, effected by the Spirit or presented by the believer. But Sanctification is here viewed as a blessing bestowed freely under the covenant of grace; and we must therefore to some extent, though not altogether, omit its ethical relations. As a privilege of the covenant, its principle is twofold: purification from sin, consecration to God; holiness being the state resulting from these. As a gift of grace, it is declared to be perfect in the design of the Spirit; and full provision is made for the Entire Sanctification of the believer in the present life, even as full provision is made for his finished Righteousness and perfect Sonship The terms which belong to this branch of Christian theology are abundant: they constitute the largest class of homogeneous phrases in the New Testament; including almost every word pertaining to the Levitical economy. In their range they embrace the entire vocabulary of the Altar, its sacrifices, oblation, and priesthood, Divine and human; sanctification, dedication, presentation, hallowing, consecration; sprinkling, washing, and putting away sin; purity, sanctity, love and holiness, and the opposites of these, with all their shades; sealing, anointing, and therefore the very word Christian itself. The original terms form a wide and sacred assemblage for the department of Biblical theology; and the careful discrimination of their meanings, in the light of the Old Testament and of classical Greek, is the best method of studying

this whole subject. They may be distributed, however, into two groups: first, those which signify the process of sanctification, as it is negative and positive, that is, as purification from sin and consecration to God; and, secondly, those which define the state of holiness, as it is imperfect and perfect, or partial and entire, sanctification. In considering these, it must be observed that we have not yet to do with ethical sanctification, but with the imparted blessing of the covenant of grace: man's efforts and attainments being subordinate. Of course the corresponding duties cannot be altogether omitted; but the distinction is important, and it must be remembered throughout our discussion of this privilege of the new covenant SANCTIFICATIONIN PRINCIPLE AND PROCESS

Sanctification, negatively considered, is purification from sin; considered positively, it is the consecration of love to God: both being the direct and sole work of the Holy Ghost, and their unity holiness

I. Purification or cleansing from sin has in the whole Bible, but especially in the New Testament, two meanings: that of a removal of the bar which prevents the Divine acceptance of the offerer at His altar, and of the defilement which renders his offering unfit to be presented. The two meanings are in fact scarcely ever throughout the entire Scriptures disjoined 1. Christians are sanctified from guilt. This may seem a strange collocation of phrases But guilt, or the consciousness of sin as our own, is not a forensic word only: it has that meaning in court, and household, and temple. It is before the Divine altar the conscience of sins1 which would keep the offerer from approaching. How much more shall the blood of Christ, Who through the Eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works?2 Here the term kathariseín is equivalent in the temple to St Paul's dikaioun in the forum of the gospel: to be purified is to have our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience,3 from the conscience or guilty consciousness of evil 1 Hebrews 10:2; 2 Hebrews 9:14; 3 Hebrews 10:22

2. They are sanctified also by the purification from their sin viewed as defilement. But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified:1 here the middle term seems to unite the two others in itself. The Old-Testament illustration of this was the purifying of the flesh,2 which was the outward symbol of deliverance not from guilt but from impurity. In fact the word washing is one of the widest terms of the class: it includes all processes for the putting away of sin whether in its guilt or in its defilement, even to the uttermost; and in this large sense the penitent Psalmist cried out for it: wash me throughly from mine iniquity,3 where iniquity stands for the defilement of which it was the cause But guilt and defilement may be here viewed as one: since the stain or MACULA of sin is its offensiveness in the sight of God, blotted out or removed when the shiner is accepted 1 1 Corinthians 6:11; 2 Hebrews 9:13; 3 Psalms 51:2

3. These two are sometimes combined and shown to correspond, in the temple service of Christianity, to the blessings of justification and regeneration in the court mediatorial and the household of faith. Mark the following striking passage: for by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified:1 made provision for their perfect pardon and holiness. Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us: for after that He had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put My laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them; and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin. In these sentences we have justification, regeneration, and sanctification united: remission of sins, the new law in the heart, and both introduced to

illustrate the Spirit's perfect sanctification. So in regard to the first Gentiles: purifying their hearts by faith,2 which must include the whole work of the Gospel on them and in them. Though the distinction should not be pressed, it may be said that the purification from guilt is effected by sprinkling as the more external and as it were imputative application of what in washing is more internal, the two however being really the same. We read in St. Peter: elect . . . through sanctification of the Spirit,3 which is divided into two branches: unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. From the defilement and internal corruption of sin Christians are cleansed or washed: that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word.4 The washing, however, sometimes must include both, as in the doxology unto Him that loved us and washed us from, our sins in His own blood:5 here the reading loúsanti is in some texts significantly changed into lúsanti Whichever reading is right, the corrector has not introduced a theological error; for the washing is equivalent to release from guilt, the loosing and the cleansing being the same

Both ideas are found in some of the synonyms employed, such as the putting away or taking away6 of sin. Sanctification has the double meaning in another passage: Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood;7 and also in such as speak of Christians as sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints.8

1 Hebrews 10:14-18; 2 Acts 15:9; 3 1 Peter 1:2; 4 Ephesians 5:26; 5 Revelation 1:5; 6 Hebrews 5:4; Hebrews 5:11; 7 Hebrews 13:12; 8 1 Corinthians 1:2

II. The positive element of sanctification is the Holy Spirit's consecration to God of what is dedicated to God by man. In the New Testament this is the love of God which is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us:1 the Divine love as the principle of consecration awakening our love as the principle of our personal dedication

1 Romans 5:5

1. There is a lower, wider, and, as it were, improper sense of the term throughout the Scriptures. (1.) What is already holy is sanctified by the acknowledgment of its holiness Hallowed be Thy name!1 Sanctify Christ as Lord in your hearts.2 Let him be holy still,3 signifying that the holiness of the saint is to mark his character until ratified and accepted in heaven. The idea here is that of absolute separation from all unholiness; and the term is always hagiazein: the recognition of an existing sanctity. (2.) What is common, and in that sense unsanctified, but without connoting so far as that is possible any moral character in the object, is made holy: the opposite of koinon hgeisthai. The temple that sanctifieth the gold.4 It is sanctified by the word of God and prayer.5 (3.) The term in these last instances refers to things; but everywhere else in the New Testament it is, used of persons, and this personal consecration may be said to absorb into itself all other meanings. It will be useful, however, to remember the distinction when we come to consider more fully the imputative character of sanctification 1 Matthew 6:9; 2 1 Peter 3:15; 3 Revelation 22:11; 4 Matthew 23:17; 5 1 Timothy 4:5

2. Consecration proper of persons is to be viewed as twofold: it is to God's possession and to God's service

(1.) The leading, or at least the most important, idea is that of possession. All men belong to God by creation; but the bestowment of the virtue of redemption makes them His in a special sense;

and if they are His then all that they have becomes His: consecration in detail follows from and is a part of the general consecration. The believer is supposed to DEDICATE himself, and the Spirit SANCTIFIES him to God. CONSECRATION is a term in English synonymous with both, common therefore to the believer and the Spirit, as in many passages. That He might sanctify and cleanse it . . . that He might present it to Himself a glorious church,1 where consecration and presentation are united as the Divine act. Here we have the sanctification following on the purification, hína auteén hagiásee katharísas, and the word dedicate or present, used of Christ Himself, even as St. Paul limits it to the believer: that ye present your bodies,2 or yield yourselves unto God.3 Both ideas are in the words and purify unto Himself a peculiar people:4 teaching also as a significant addition that the consecration is to Christ as Divine; for none but God receives the consecrated object. The possession, however, is the same as union and fellowship The souls that are dedicated and consecrated to God are not merely His; they have also the most intimate union with Him. Truly our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ:5 a fellowship of sanctification dependent on our being cleansed from sin. It is the glory of the believer's relation to God in the new covenant that it is more than being simply His property. It is a transcendent and mystical communion: sanctify them through Thy truth; and I in them and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one.6 1 Ephesians 5:26-27; 2 Romans 12:1; 3 Romans 6:13; 4 Titus 2:14; 5 1 John 1:3; 1 John 1:7

(2.) Then follows consecration to the service of God. The Divine temple and the Divine service are correlative terms. The whole life of the Christian is spent in a sanctuary. The people are the house of God: ye are the temple of the living God;1 their life is their worship: to offer up spiritual sacrifices;2 and He is Himself the temple in which we live, and move, and have our being:3 for he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God.4 Hence the spirit of consecration is that of entire devotion to the Divine service. Christians are vessels unto honor, sanctified and meet for the Master's use.5 1 2 Corinthians 6:16; 2 1 Peter 2:5; 3 Acts 17:28; 4 1 John 4:16; 5 2 Timothy 2:21

3. The Holy Ghost is the seal and the power of this consecration; and these as it were in one, yet with a distinction: He is the SEAL1 of God's possession, and the POWER of dedication to God's service. After that ye believed2—or on believing, ye were sealed, pisteúsantes, with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession: here God's possession is sealed till He finally redeems it; and the seal that sets apart His people is the beginning of their own experience of religion, which is the possession of God as their inheritance. The mere contact with the altar sanctified the gold, but the spirit of man is sanctified by no less than the indwelling Spirit. The consciousness of the presence of the Holy Ghost within is the testimony to the Christian that he is sanctified to God: as to his pardon and adoption the Spirit as it were speaketh expressly; but his sanctification is silently declared by His very presence and indwelling. So much for the former, the Seal; as to the latter, the Power, the Holy Ghost is the energy of the soul's consecration to the will and service of God The faith which worketh by love3 is the faith which is the fruit of the Spirit.4 It is the strength of all obedience, and resignation, and devotion. The Spirit whose indwelling assures of acceptance is the power of a final consecration of every faculty to God: entire sanctification—to anticipate—is this, whatever else. It is the full, unhindered, unlimited, almighty energy of the power of His presence in the soul 1 Ephesians 1:13-14; 2 Ephesians 1:13-14; 3 Galatians 5:6; 4 Galatians 5:22

III. The unity of these is HOLINESS. Those who are purged, or sprinkled from sin, which is separation from God, and who are consecrated to Him, are holy or saints, hagios

Christ is their hagiasmos: the ground or principle or source of their sanctification as in process, in every sense negativing their sin. The state in which they live is that of Hagioosúne, or holiness

1. It is a relative sanctity: not of course forensic, but corresponding nevertheless to the imputation of righteousness. As there is a holy day, a holy church, a holy city; and as whatsoever toucheth the altar shall be holy,1 be accounted holy, so Christians are an holy nation.2 The holy city3 was most impure when so called, in remembrance of its past, and as yet not altogether forfeited, sanctity; and the congregation of Corinth were addressed notwithstanding their partial unholiness as sanctified in Christ Jesus.4 1 Exodus 29:37; 2 1 Peter 2:9; 3 Matthew 27:53; 4 1 Corinthians 1:2

2. But this last quotation indicates that it is also an internal holiness: not only called saints but called to be saints: the addition in the translation precisely expresses the double truth, that all who are called saints are called to become such. These same Corinthians termed holy are exhorted to attain moral sanctity: let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God,1 pneúmatos epiteloúntes hagioosúneen. As the soul is one and indivisible, its leading principle of consecration to God gives it its character, though that is not yet perfect. The daily, habitual washing cleanseth us from all sin,2 katharízei, as a fountain continually sending its streams over the soul 1 2 Corinthians 7:1; 2 1 John 1:7

3. The external and internal holiness are always combined in the purpose of God. No sanctity possible to man, even at the foot of the throne, is perfect without imputation. The past sin is regarded as for ever sprinkled away: it remains as a fact of history, but a cancelled fact; as defilement that once was, but is now effaced. But no imputation of sanctity as belonging to the church will avail without the reality. In the attainment of Christian perfection the external and the internal are one

4. Many other terms are used to denote the estate of holiness under each of the two aspects of purification and consecration. It is described rather with reference to the Divine act in hagiasmós, SANCTIFICATION. Christ is made unto us sanctification;1 The will of God, even your sanctification;2 Chosen unto sanctification of the Spirit:3 thus referring to each person of the Trinity. Purification results in PURITY: besides the more limited agneia the term agnoths, pureness,4 is used. He that hath this hope in Him purifieth himself, even as He is pure.5 Katharismos includes deliverance both from guilt and from pollution: objectively, when He had by Himself purged our sins;6 subjectively, hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins.7 Though the distinction is not absolute, positive consecration to God is generally expressed by the word sanctification itself Our Lord first spoke of His own as sanctified through the truth:8 this, following I sanctify Myself, must refer to a positive consecration to God. There is no other term which in the Greek Testament expresses the positive side of dedication to God. But the consecrated state is variously viewed. He maketh intercession for the saints:9 the word saints here refers to the high ideal character of those who love God, and of whom the whole process of salvation is affirmed. Sanctified in Christ Jesus:10 Christ is the scene, and sphere, and region, the temple, and shrine, and holiest, in which believers are consecrated and set apart. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all:11 here the term is heegiasménoi, ideally and completely sanctified in virtue of the one perfect offering. For by one

offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified: here the word is hagiazoménous, in course or process of sanctification, and ideally perfected or rendered independent of any other sacrifice. In the purpose of redemption they are the Lord’s for ever

1 1 Corinthians 1:30; 2 1 Thessalonians 4:3; 3 1 Peter 1:2; 4 2 Corinthians 6:6; 5 1 John 3:3; 6 Hebrews 1:3; 7 2 Peter 1:9; 8 John 17:19; 9 Romans 8:27-28; 10 1 Corinthians 1:2; 11 Hebrews 10:10; Hebrews 10:14

5. It is worthy of remark that consecration to God as a state is predicated of man’s nature in all its constituent elements. And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless.1 " Hence it is said, Your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost;2 and the exhortation is to present your bodies,3 that the Spirit may consecrate and sanctify them to God. This is the characteristic distinction of sanctification: it is of the whole man viewed in all the constituents of his nature. It cannot be said of justification, as the body of the justified person is dead because of sin,4 and not yet released from the executioner; nor, as yet, of adoption, which includes the whole man only at the last day, as the sons of God will be altogether such only when they become the children of the resurrection.5 1 1 Thessalonians 5:23; 2 1 Corinthians 6:19; 3 Romans 12:1; 4 Romans 8:10; 5 Luke 20:10 SANCTIFICATION PROGRESSIVE AND PERFECT

While there is a sense in which sanctification is a permanent and unchangeable principle, it is also a process which reaches its consummation, according to the provisions of the New Covenant and the testimony of the Spirit, in the present life

1. It is obvious that wherever the term is used to signify that in the temple which justification means in the lawcourt of Christianity it admits of no change. The worshippers, once purged, should have had no more conscience of sins.1 The term purged is afterwards varied into sanctified, kekatharisménous becomes heegiasménoi: by the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.2 Like justification this sanctification is a definitive act; and the sanctified, like the justified, live without the consciousness of sin as an obstacle to entrance into the holiest having their hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience.3 1 Hebrews 10:2; 2 Hebrews 10:10; 3 Hebrews 10:22

2. The positive consecration also knows no change as a principle. Whatever is on the altar that sanctifieth the gift1 is, in virtue of being on it, the Lord’s: nothing can be at one and the same time both sanctified and not sanctified. The Holy Spirit—Who is the Lord and Giver of holiness as well as of life, these two being the same—is once bestowed, and once for all, on believers who were sealed as His until the redemption of the purchased possession.2 All who are born of God in the New economy enter into the privileges of the firstborn under the Old. The adopted children of the house are sanctified in the temple: sanctify unto Me all the firstborn.3 The consecrating principle of love is the first grace of the new birth. It is in all its degrees the permanent instrument of the Spirit’s sanctification of the regenerate soul 1 Matthew 22:19; 2 Ephesians 1:13-14; 3 Exodus 13:2

3. Holiness as a state is also in the usage of Scripture unchangeable. The New Testament speaks of that state as ideal, and as virtually perfected in all who belong to Christ. In this sense also, He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one.1 They are seen by anticipation, which to God is not anticipation, as sanctified in Christ Jesus.2 In the backward perspective of St. Paul,

they are already conformed to the image of HisSong of Solomon 3:1-11 which is once more sanctification in terms borrowed from Christian sonship 1 Hebrews 2:11; 2 1 Corinthians 1:2; 3 Romans 8:29 PROGRESSIVE SANCTIFICATION In His administration of sanctifying grace the Holy Spirit proceeds by degrees. Terms of progress are applied to each department of that work in the saint; or, in other words, the goal of entire sanctification is represented as the end of a process in which the Spirit requires the cooperation of the believer. This co-operation, however, is only the condition on which is suspended what is the work of Divine grace alone

I. The negative side of sanctification as the removal of sin is described as a process; but chiefly in terms of the regenerate life

1. The most familiar is that which represents the sinning nature as under the doom of death. Our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be done away, that henceforth we should not serve sin:1 crucifixion is a gradual mortal process, disqualifying the body from serving any master, and as such certainly tending to death. So in the parallel to the Galatians: they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with its passions and lusts.2 And elsewhere they are said to put off the old man and put on the newMan 1:3 Moreover, in the last passage the Apostle bids us mortify therefore your members by killing, or weakening down to extinction, every individual tendency or disposition to evil Not only is the old man to be destroyed by the doom of crucifixion, but every specific member of his sin is to be surrendered to atrophy: Make not provision for the flesh, to fulfill the lusts thereof.4 Crucifixion is of the whole body: mortification is of each member. Now, while all these passages refer to the earnest self-discipline of the believer, entering into the design of redemption, they represent only the submission of faith which brings into the soul the virtue of the lifegiving and deathgiving Spirit. If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit:5 walk in the way of sorrow, the via dolorosa, that leads to death, the death of sin. If ye THROUGH THE SPIRIT do mortify the deeds of the body ye shall live.6 It is the Holy Ghost who does what we do through Him 1 Romans 6:6; 2 Galatians 5:24; 3 Colossians 3:5; Colossians 3:9-10; 4 Romans 13:14; 5 Galatians 5:25; 6 Romans 8:13

2. From this we may deduce two principles. First, the general bias, or character of the soul, becomes positively more and more alienated from sin and set upon good; and, proportionally, the susceptibility to temptation or the affinity with sin becomes negatively less and less evident in its consciousness. There is in the healthy progress of the Christian a constant confirmation of the will in its ultimate choice, and a constant increase of its power to do what it wills: the vanishing point of perfection in the will is to be entirely merged in the will of God. There is also a perpetual weakening of the susceptibility to temptation: what was at first a hard contest gradually advances to the sublime triumph of the Savior, Get thee hence, Satan!1 Every active and every passive grace steadily advances: and sin fades out of the nature. Every habit of evil is unwound from the life; until at length the Christian can say, like his Master, The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in Me.2 This gradual and sure depression of the sinful principle down to its zero or limit of nonentity is progressive sanctification. He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness:3 by a beautiful confusion of figures the obliquity remaining in the soul is a defilement which is in process of being entirely cleansed away. This refers to particular sins: more generally, the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin.4 1Matthew 4:10; 2 John 14:30; 3 1 John 1:9; 4 1 John 1:7 II. The positive side—that of consecration by the Spirit of love—is also a process, a gradual process 1. The Spirit Himself is given by measure1 to us,

though not to the Incarnate Son for us Of this great gift it holds good: unto every one which hath shall be given.2 The exhortation is to be filled with the Spirit.3 Of the first Pentecostal Christians it is said that they were filled with the Holy Ghost;4 but we afterwards find variations of gift and fluctuations in faithful use of the gift down to the lowest point of declension: sensual, having not the Spirit.5 1 John 3:34; 2 Luke 19:26; 3 Ephesians 5:18; 4 Acts 2:4; 5 Jude 1:19

2. Hence the shedding abroad of the love of God by the Holy Ghost admits of increase. It is enough to cite the Apostle's prayer: that your love may abound yet more and more.1 This, in harmony with the uniform tenor of Scripture, refers to the growth of love towards God and man. It is more important to show that the love of God towards us, or, as St John calls it, love with us,—where the love of God to us and our love to. Him because He first loved us,2 are the same—is a progressive and ever-strengthening principle. St. John in his first Epistle proves this. Once he uses an expression which indicates that the love of God attains a perfect operation in us. En toútoo teteleíootai hee agápee meth heemoón: herein is our love—or love with us—made perfect.3 St. Paul says, the love of Christ constraineth us:4 meaning that love in us which constraineth Christ Himself: How am I straitened till it be accomplished!5 The term sunéchomai points to a gradually deepening pressure, and, as in the Lord Himself so in His servants, the power of love drives every impediment before it. In His servants, but not as in the Lord Himself, it gradually, surely, and effectually gathers itself within closer and closer bonds until its force becomes irresistible. And of that same love the Ephesian prayer asks: that ye being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth and length and depth and height; and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge.6 1 Php 1:9; 2 1 John 4:17; 1 John 4:19; 3 1 John 4:17; 4 2 Corinthians 5:14; 5 Luke 12:50; 6 Ephesians 3:18-19

III. Holiness as an estate is also described as progressive: first, as a goal to be attained; to be attained, secondly, through human effort; but, lastly, only as the bestowment of the Holy Ghost, the Supreme Agent of all good

1. Once we have the expression perfecting holiness,1 epiteloúntes, where the word indicates an end to which effort is ever converging, whether that end be fully attained or not: in any case it is a progress. Again, St. Paul prays, The very God of peace sanctify you wholly,2 where the gradual perfecting of body, soul and spirit is obviously referred to Again, a still higher prayer, Sanctify them through Thy truth: Thy word is truth!3 truth, however, which the Lord always speaks of as gradually imparted, He will guide you into all truth;4 and of which He says, If ye continue in My word, then are ye My disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.5 But the clearest evidence is in the tenor of the language used on the subject, of which this is a specimen: For both He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one.6 The brethren, whom the High Priest gradually succors and saves, are hoi hagiazómenoi, those who are in process of sanctification: parallel with toús soozoménous, such as were in process of salvation.7 It is important to remember the form of the present participles in these passages: in the latter it is not sesosmenous, such as were effectually saved, nor sothmsomenous, such as should be saved; in the former it is not hagiasmenoi, such as were once for all sanctified 1 2 Corinthians 7:1; 2 1 Thessalonians 5:23; 3 John 17:17; 4 John 16:13; 5 John 8:31-32; 6 Hebrews 2:11; 7 Acts 2:47

2. The sanctification administered, effected, imparted as the free gift of the Holy Ghost is also conditional on the effort of man. Here the blessing of the Christian covenant enters into the ethical

region. It is exceedingly difficult to keep the two apart. Reserving for Christian Ethics the consideration of much that belongs to the subject, we note that the process of sanctification keeps pace with the fulfillment of certain conditions. A few illustrations, referring to each department, will be enough

(1.) We are exhorted as Christians to cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit:1 this is remarkable as being one of the few passages in which the Levitical cleansing of the Holy Ghost is actually made a human work, katharísoomen. Such passages, the force of which can be felt only in the original Greek, ought to be carefully studied, as shedding a rich light upon the whole doctrine of human co-operation with Divine grace. The same things are true in Him and in us. St. James says:

Katharísate, cleanse your hands, and hagnísate, purify your hearts.2 And St. Paul uses the strong expression mortify therefore your members:3 Nekroósate, a word which seems to appropriate the special office of the Holy Ghost, who alone in this sense can say, I kill and I make alive.4 Christians are said to put off the old man and to put on the new man No one understands all these passages aright who does not see that they all hang upon one principle, that the Spirit's work in us is made our own. Having these promises5 governs them all. But, on the other hand, such passages would not be found were it not the intention of the Spirit to impress on us a high estimate of our own responsibility 1 2 Corinthians 7:1; 2 James 4:8; 3 Colossians 3:5; Colossians 3:9-10; 4 Deuteronomy 32:39; 5 2 Corinthians 7:1

(2.) Nothing is more constantly declared than that the effusion of the Spirit of consecration keeps pace with the co-operation of the believer. Whether he regards love as that of God to us, or as the response in us to Him, St. John inculcates the need of our compliance with conditions. But whoso keepeth His word, in him verily is the love of God perfected: hereby know we that we are in Him.1 Not by the sovereign and arbitrary despotism of grace, but as the blessing resting on earnest and universal obedience, which itself is of God, is love made perfect. Again: If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and His love is perfected in us. Hereby know we that we dwell in Him and He in us, because He hath given us of His Spirit.2 The Spirit of our union with God is a Spirit of consecration perfectly sanctifying those who abound in self-sacrificing devotion to others. Once more: God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him. Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment: because as He is, so are we in this world.3 Though the perfect copying of the Lord's example is not exactly a condition, it is a close concomitant, of the perfect effusion of the consecrating Spirit. In all three cases the indwelling of God by the Spirit is the efficient cause, while OBEDIENCE, CHARITY to man, and the IMITATION OF CHRIST are the three-one condition. Love is the channel for imparting and the instrument for producing love: FROM LOVE TO LOVE answering here to St. Paul's from faith to faith.4 We have, however, to do simply with the evidence afforded, that the consecration of love is a conditional process The spirit of devotion to God becomes stronger in proportion as these conditions are kept in dependence on the Spirit who imparts that love 1 1 John 2:5; 2 1 John 4:12-13; 3 1 John 4:16-17; 4 Romans 1:17

(3.) As to the state of holiness it is a goal to the attainment of which Christian men are habitually required to bend their effort. It is the object of their own aspiration. This is generally and. universally true: it is the secret and strength of the command, perfecting holiness.1 Here we may

combine the idea of holiness with those of righteousness and sonship: the three are one in the perfection which they require the Christian to keep in view. As to righteousness: that the requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us,2 in whom love is the fulfilling of the law.3 The word fulfilled here must have its full force; it refers to the gradual accomplishment of a design. But it must be carefully noted that the Divine power in this accomplishment has the pre-eminence. Indeed the word pleerooma belongs strictly only to God, for it is He who fulfils the demands of righteousness; while the addition in us who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit sufficiently vindicates our use of the text: the Divine grace in our lives gradually and surely works out the requirements of the new evangelical law interpreted by grace. And this new law defies the criticism of man: it is the righteousness of God,4 who is the only Lawgiver. As to sonship: The Father did predestinate to be conformed to the image of HisSong of Solomon 5:1-16 children who are changed into the same image from glory to glory.6 The decree that every child of God shall be like that Holy Child,7 the Eternal Son made flesh, is revealed in the inmost soul; and the Spirit of adoption within us seeks the form of the Pattern in His word, and for ever contemplates it with a transforming love. As to holiness: Be ye holy; for I am holy.8 To all these the Savior refers in the benedictions of the Sermon on the Mount

Blessed arethey which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled:9 this is the blessing of the evangelical law. It is the benediction pronounced, as we believe, by anticipation, on the diligent pursuit of the new righteousness of faith, the deep meaning of which was not yet revealed. Hence the force of the future, they shall be filled

Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God:10 this is the blessing of entire consecration, which is, negatively, that of the pure or the sanctified from sin, and, positively, that of the pure in heart, or those whose heart and inmost personality are inflamed with the love of all holiness. Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God:11 this is the blessing promised to the future Christian household, one in perfect brotherly love and in the diffusion of its peace. But these and all other blessings are promised to those who by patient continuance in well-doing seek them. Christian perfection is the exceeding great reward of perseverance in the renunciation of all things for God; in the exercise of love to God, as shown in passive submission and active devotion, and in the strenuous obedience of all His commandments. The heirs of the Christian inheritance are led and not rapt into the land of uprightness:12 there is no suspension in their case of the general law which governs all the Divine dealings with man. As there is a preliminary grace which leads to the perfect life of regeneration, so there is a preliminary regenerate grace which leads to the perfection of consecration to God. For whosoever hath to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance:13 a word of our Lord which has a wide application throughout the entire range of Christian theology

1 2 Corinthians 7:1; 2 Romans 8:4; 3 Romans 8:10; 4 Romans 3:21; 5 Romans 8:29; 6 2 Corinthians 3:18; 7 Acts 4:27; 8 1 Peter 1:16; 9 Matthew 5:6; 10 Matthew 5:8; 11 Matthew 5:9; 12 Psalms 143:10; 13 Matthew 13:12

3. Is then the process of sanctification ended by an attainment which rewards human endeavor simply? Assuredly not: the Holy Spirit finishes the work in His own time, and in His own way, as His own act, and in the absolute supremacy if not in the absolute sovereignty of His own gracious power

(1.) Every act and every habit of holiness is of the Spirit. Though those who are Christ's are said themselves to have crucified the flesh with its passions and lusts,1 this is a union with the mystery of the cross in the fellowship of Him Who died, unto sin once,2 which only the Spirit can effect: hence it immediately follows, If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit. Whatever is done by man in the mortification of his sin is really done by the Holy Ghost in him. Self-crucifixion is abhorrent to human nature, and to human nature impossible. Approaches to it may be found in human ethics; but its inmost secret is never reached save as the mystical teaching of the Cross. When our Savior commanded His follower to hate yea his own life also,3 He first illustrated His precept by His own self-sacrifice, and then left His Spirit to teach the stern lesson to His people. He alone can teach it. No man ever yet hated his own flesh:4 applying this to his sinful flesh,5 we may say that what no man ever did by nature the grace of God can make him do. So also the highest term for the consecration of the purified is reserved for the Spirit: while all but the highest are given to the believer. If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honor, sanctified:6 ekkatharee heauton, his own work; heegiasmenon, the Divine work in him. While the Christian keeps his evil nature impaled on the interior cross, it is the sword of the Spirit from on high that takes its life away; and when he is entirely swayed by Divine love, this is the law of the Spirit of life7 within him 1 Galatians 5:24-25; 2 Romans 6:10; 3 Luke 14:26; 4 Ephesians 5:29; 5 Romans 8:3; 6 2 Timothy 2:21; 7 Romans 8:2

(2.) There is a consummation of the Christian experience which may be said to introduce perfection, when the Spirit cries, IT is FINISHED, in the believer. The moment when sin expires, known only to God, is the Divine victory over sin in the soul: this is the office of the Spirit alone. The moment when love becomes supreme in its ascendancy, a moment known only to God, is the Spirit's triumph in the soul's consecration: this also is entirely His work. And whenever that maturity of Christian experience and life is reached which the Apostle prays for so often, it is solely through the operation of the same Spirit. It is being filled into all the fullness of God,1 and that through being strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man 1 Ephesians 3:16-19

(3.) While, therefore, the tenor of the New Testament represents entire sanctification as the result of a process, it is also ascribed to the result of the constant effusion of the Holy Ghost, crowned in one last and consummating act of His power. Of this resurrection also we may ask, as the Apostle asked concerning another, Why should it be thought a thing incredible?1 And with the same emphasis: ti; what? a thing incredible that GOD should raise the dead! should raise a dead soul to perfect life! 1 Acts 26:8

(4.) But, lastly, it must be remembered that this final and decisive act of the Spirit is the seal set upon a previous and continuous work. The processes may be hastened and condensed into a short space; they must be passed through as processes. Yea, we establish the law1 was the Apostle's vindication of the doctrine of faith counted far righteousness:

2 and the same vindication is necessary for the process of sanctification. The justified have their fruit unto holiness.3 Uniting the life of justification with that of sanctification our Lord said: I am come that they might have life,4 and that they might have it MORE: the same gift expanding unto perfection for ever. There is no new dispensation of the Spirit in any such sense as there was a new covenant superseding the old: the Spirit of entire sanctification is only the Spirit of the beginning of grace exerting an ampler power

Never do we read of a HIGHER LIFE that is other than the intensification of the lower; never of a SECOND BLESSING that is more than the unrestrained outpouring of the same Spirit who gave the first. Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?5 means, Did you receive the Holy Ghost on believing? elabete pisteusantes and cannot refer to a reception of the higher gift superinduced on a lower gift which was without the Spirit of entire consecration. The only instance in which Christians are said to be without the Spirit6 is that one in which St. Jude describes the fallen state of men who, to use St. Paul's words, having begun in the Spirit were now made perfect in the flesh:7 had reached the most lamentable issue of being sensual again. Moreover, this was said to a portion, though an ignorant portion, of the same Ephesian congregation to whom St. Paul wrote: After that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise,8 pisteusantes esfragisteete, believing ye were sealed. There is no restraint of time with the Holy Ghost The preparations for an entire consecration to God may be long continued or they may be hastened. Whenever the seal of perfection is set on the work, whether in death or in life, it must be a critical and instantaneous act; possibly known to God alone, or, if revealed in the trembling consciousness of the believer, a secret that he knows not how to utter. But this leads us from the Sanctuary to the Most Holy Place 1 Romans 3:31; 2 Romans 4:5; 3 Romans 6:22; 4 John 10:10; 5 Acts 19:2; 6 Jude 1:19; 7 Galatians 3:3; 8 Ephesians 1:13 ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION

Provision is made in the Christian covenant for the completeness of the Saviour's work as the perfect application of His atonement to the believer. This may be viewed as the complete destruction of sin, as the entireness of consecration to God, and as the state of consummate holiness to which the character of the saint may be formed in the present life. These privileges may be regarded respectively as Entire Sanctification, Perfect Love, and Evangelical Perfection: these being one as the finished application of the Saviour's Finished Work, so far as its consummation belongs to time and to grace

It is not meant that these three are distinct branches of Christian privilege. Each implies the other; and neither can be treated without involving the rest. Nor are the terms exact as indicating each its particular department: for instance, sanctification is as much positive consecration to God as negative purifying from sin. But the distinction is convenient as giving opportunity for a methodical, and, if the term may be admitted, scientific view of all sides of a deeply important question. Controversy will be excluded as out of harmony with this most sacred subject: what polemical reference may be necessary will be reserved for the Historical Review PURIFICATION FROM SIN OR ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION The virtue of the atonement, administered by the Holy Spirit, is set forth in Scripture as effecting the entire destruction of sin. This is everywhere declared to be the design of redemption: and it is promised to the believer as his necessary preparation for the future life. The entire removal of sin from the nature is nowhere connected with any other means than the word of God received in faith and proved in experience

I. The work of Christ has for its end the removal of sin from the nature of man: from the nature of the believer in this present life. No end is kept more constantly before us

1. Generally viewed, this is an uncontested truth. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested) that He might destroy the works of the devil:1 words which refer to evil in Christian individuals, and not only to the whole empire of sin and Satan, as the scene of active rebellion, in the history of our race. The words are introduced between two others which give them a deep and unlimited

meaning. He was manifested to take away our sins; and in Him is no sin.2 Sinless Himself He makes His people sinless. Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin3 in outward act; he cannot sin because he is born of God, in inward principle. And this is said of the final and distinguishing mark of those who are thus approved, in the highest ideal sense made real, as the children of God: in this the children of God are manifest and the children of the devil. The manifestation is here the full and finished revelation of their internal birth of God. He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself:4 atheteesai, to abolish, a term which goes beyond the sacrificial terminology of the Epistle, like that of the Baptist: Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.5 Our Lord gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works:6 here is every term of sanctification applied to the design of Christ's death as it regards those who, being capable of good works, must of course be regarded as still living upon earth. Hence St. John testifies that the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth from all sin:7 both in the Levitical and in the moral sense, FROM ALL SIN, from all that is called sin, whether it be its guilt before God or its power in man. And St. Paul declares it to be the design of our crucifixion with Christ, that is of our union by faith with Christ's death to sin, that the body of sin might be destroyed:8 that sin actuating our mortal bodies, and making it its servant, might be deprived of us as its slaves, the body of our service being abolished. He that is dead is freed9 or justified from sin; so the earthly instrument of service is destroyed that we henceforth should not serve sin. It is not merely that the slavery of sin is ended; but the body that serves is to be altogether abolished

There cannot be service if there is nothing wherewith to serve. Therefore, finally, these Apostles unite in exhorting Christians to regard themselves as altogether delivered from the law of sin. St. John says: these things write I unto you, that ye sin not.10 St. Paul, yet more comprehensively, reckon ye also yourselves [to be] dead indeed unto sin:11 a moral imputation in ourselves answering to God's forensic imputation. St. John evidently refers to God's purpose that the cleansing efficacy should deliver from sin; and his qualification if any man sin12 only puts the case as one not contemplated as of necessity but provided for us in mercy. St. Paul bids us make a generous use of the doctrine of imputation; and rejoice in the consciousness that we may be, and shall be, saved from all connection with evil. These several passages in their combination establish generally the whole doctrine of a purification provided for all sin

1 1 John 3:8; 2 1 John 3:5; 3 1 John 3:9; 4 Hebrews 9:26; 5 John 1:29; 6 Titus 2:14; 7 1 John 1:7; 8 Romans 6:6; 9 Romans 6:7; 10 1 John 2:1; 11 Romans 6:11; 12 1 John 2:1

2. More particularly, we have to do with Original Sin. This has two meanings here: it is the individual portion of the common heritage, and it is the common sin that infects the race of man during the whole evolution of its history in time

(1.) As to the latter, it is not to be doubted that original sin, or sin as generic and belonging to the race in its federal constitution on earth, is not abolished till the time of which it is said, Behold, I make all things new:1 as something of the penalty remains untaken away, so also something of the peculiar concupiscence or liability to temptation or affinity with evil that besets man in this world remains. The saint delivered from personal sin is still connected with sin by his own past: the one forgiveness is regarded as perpetually renewed until the final act of mercy. If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves:2 we are numbered with the transgressors in one sense still,

though not reckoned with them in another. There is no man who must not join in the prayer: Forgive us our trespasses.3 Hence it is not usual to speak of original sin, absolutely, as done away in Christ. The race has its sin that doth so easily beset,4 its euperistaton hamartian; and we must cease to belong to the lineage of Adam before our unsinning state becomes sinlessness 1 Revelation 21:5; 2 1 John 1:8; 3 Matthew 6:12; 4 Hebrews 12:1

(2.) But original sin, as in the unrenewed, sin that dwelleth in1 the Me of the soul, as the principle in man that has actual affinity with transgression, or the source and law of sin which is in my members,2 or the animating soul of the body of this death,3 and, in believers, the flesh with its passions and lusts,4 is abolished by the SPIRIT OF HOLINESS indwelling in the Christian, when His purifying grace has its perfect work 1 Romans 7:17; Romans 7:20; 2 Romans 7:23; 3 Romans 7:24; 4 Galatians 5:24

3. And certainly the scene of our Saviour's atoning sacrifice is always set forth as the scene of His redeeming power. There is only one redemption which is reserved for His second coming: the redemption of our body.1 But there is no other. The argument is complete in itself, and scarcely needs further corroboration. The counteraction of sin must needs be entire and complete in man and upon earth: the other world is the sphere of fruition and judgment. There is no hint given in the Scriptural history of redemption that the finished triumph of the Deliverer from sin is never to be known in this world. But this leads us onward

1 Romans 8:23

II. Full deliverance from sin is both required and promised as the preparation for final admission to the presence of God

1. We are exhorted to holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord:1 with this declaration may be connected the command, remembering its solemn relation to the day of Him who judgeth according to every man's work, quoting from the Old Testament, Be ye holy; for 1 am holy.2 But both warning and command had been anticipated by the promise: Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God,3 a Benediction not reserved, any more than the others which surround it, for the world to come 1 Hebrews 12:14; 2 1 Peter 1:16-17; 3 Matthew 5:8

2. Prayer—especially that of our Lord and His servant Paul— is used as the vehicle of teaching this. Sanctify them through Thy truth ! . . . that they all may be one, as Thou Father art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us.1 The unity in one mystical body, and that one mystical body united to God in Christ as the Persons of the Trinity are internally united, is simply and only the perfection of Christian sanctification: in this world, for men are thence to believe that Thou hast sent Me. Higher than this language cannot go, but St. Paul's Prayers do not fall below it. He has in every Epistle save one a petition for the entire sanctification of those to whom he writes, and sometimes with an express reference to the presentation of this sanctity to Christ at His coming. The first of them says: to the end He may stablish your hearts unblameable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all His saints.2 And this follows a prayer for their abundance of brotherly love and universal charity. The prayers found in the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians disdain or leave far beneath them any interpretation lower than that of the attainment of perfect sanctity. Purification from all sin, entire consecration to God, and a state of holiness leaving no room for imperfection, are all found in the

central and supreme prayer of St Paul: and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled into all the fullness of God.3 Its doxology makes this sure: Now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think It also shows why the doctrine is so much misapprehended: neither the ASKING nor the THINKING of the Church—especially the latter—has kept up to the high standard of Gospel privilege 1 John 17:17; John 17:21; 2 1 Thessalonians 3:12-13; 3 Ephesians 3:14-21

3. Scripture presents a sinless state as actually attained in this life. Perfect love casteth out fear:1 mark hee teleia agapee, which is certainly love in the human soul; the casting out of fear, which is the casting out of sin, the only cause of fear; and the whole context

There is nothing plainer in the Bible than this its last testimony concerning the privilege of Christian experience. I am crucified with Christ; yet I live; though no longer I, but Christ liveth in me:2 here St. Paul with the profoundest humility declares at least the possible suppression of the self of sin. Though in the contest of a later chapter the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh, it is only that ye might not do the things that ye would.3 The victory is complete in the final echo of the same words: by Whom the world is crucified unto Me. and I unto the world.4 The triple crucifixion, to the law, to sin itself, and to the world, is unto death, perfect and absolute death 1 1 John 4:18; 2 Galatians 2:20; 3 Galatians 5:17; 4 Galatians 6:14

III. No instrumentality in the impartation of this grace is ever referred to but the Gospel and its agencies consciously received

1. The discipline of affliction is among the instrumentalities of grace, which transforms all the sorrows of the believer in Christ into the fellowship of His sufferings, the being made conformable unto His death.1 But this is conscious discipline. Physical dying is not so: that death is not the putting off of the old man or the body of sin. The notion that we are not finally separated from the evil adhering to our nature until we are separated from the flesh is a subtle relic of Gnosticism. The only BODY OF SIN2 in Scripture is, first, the physical body as the instrument of the sinning soul, and, secondly, the figurative old man regarded as living simultaneously with the new, though only as a doomed and superfluous offender. But it is the privilege of the believer to cease from both before physical or natural dissolution. There is no virus, no substance of evil, no added element infused by it, that requires the disintegration of death for its removal. Sin is in one sense only a negation: it is the disorder of the soul which the restoration of the will to its unity with the Divine will perfectly repairs. Nor is there any Scriptural trace of a Purgatorial purification after death. Even those who believe in such an intermediate discipline, as necessary for the consummation of the work only begun on earth, do not profess to think that it is absolutely necessary in all cases 1 Php 3:10; 2 Romans 6:6

2. The only outer court of preparation is the present life. The Scripture speaks of no waterpots after the manner of the purifying of the Jews1 set at the threshold of the eternal temple, of no final baptism at the gate of heaven. We read everywhere, especially in the Apocalypse, of the final gratification of all unsatisfied hope: save that of deliverance from sin, which is never included. We hear beforehand the rejoicings of Paradise: they do not exult over this evil as at length destroyed. Among the prophecies concerning the final blessedness we find that there shall be no more curse2—the penalty of sin—but not that there shall be no more sin. Christ will come at His final appearing without sin, unto salvation: without provision for its removal, for He hath already put

away sin, by the sacrifice of Himself,3 at His first appearing. As to His visible Church His second coming will put away its indwelling evil by casting out whatsoever offends. It will not be so as to His individual saints: in each of them the indwelling sin must at that day be searched for and not found 1 John 2:6; 2 Revelation 22:3; 3 Hebrews 9:26-28 ENTIRE CONSECRATION OR PERFECT LOVE The Spirit is imparted in His fullness for the entire consecration of the soul to the Triune God: the love of God, having its perfect work in us, is the instrument of our deliverance from indwelling sin; and the return of our love made perfect also is the strength of our obedience unto entire holiness. This is abundantly attested as the possible and attained experience of Christians

I. The commandment of the entire Scriptures, from beginning to end, is that of perfect consecration to God; and the spring and energy of that consecration is love

1. The love of God is the same in the Old Testament and in the New. It is not a sentiment of the mind alone, nor an affection of the sensibility alone, nor an energy of the will alone; but it is the devotion of the man, in the integrity of all these, to God as the one Object and Rest and Centre and Life of the soul. What doth the Lord thy God require of thee, but to fear the Lord thy God, to walk in all His ways, and to love Him, and to serve the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul?1 Here perfect love stands between perfect fear and perfect service as the bond and complement of both. Our Lord has not even changed the words, which He quotes; He has not said of this: a new commandment I give unto you.2 It is the old commandment which ye had from the beginning,3 the universal law of all intelligent creatures: to make God their only Object, the Supreme End of their existence; the neighbor and all other things being objects of love only in Him, hid with Christ in God.4 This commandment is the measure of Evangelical privilege, which the believer has only to accept, and wonder at, and believe, and attain 1 Deuteronomy 10:12; 2 John 13:34; 3 1 John 2:7; 4 Colossians 3:3

2. Its perfection is simply its soleness and supremacy. It is not in the measure of its intensity, which never ceases to increase throughout eternity until it reaches the maximum, if such there be, of creaturely strength; but, in the quality of its unique and sovereign ascendancy, it has the crisis of perfection set before it as attainable. In the interpretation of heaven that love is perfect which carries with it the whole man and all that he has and is. Its perfection is negative, when no other object, that is no creature, receives it apart from God or in comparison of Him; and it is positive when the utmost strength of the faculties, in the measure and according to the degree of their possibility on earth, is set on Him. Thus interpreted no law of the Bible is more absolute than this of the perfect love of God. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind.1 Omitting the last, with all thy mind,2 this was the ancient law, concerning which the promise was: The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God.3 The quaternion of attributes— or the heart as the one personality, to which the understanding and affections and will belong—as our Lord has completed it, leaves no room for imperfection. However far this may go beyond our theories and our hopes and our attainments, it is and must be the standard of privilege. We are now concerned only with the privileges of the covenant of redemption as administered by the Holy Ghost 1 Luke 10:27; 2 Deuteronomy 6:5; 3 Deuteronomy 30:6

II. The Spirit of God, as the Spirit of perfect consecration, is poured out upon the Christian Church. And He discharges His sanctifying office as an indwelling Spirit: able perfectly to fill the soul with

love, and to awaken a perfect love in return

1. The last document of the New Testament gives clear expression to the former. We love [Him] because He first loved us.1 The Divine love to man in redemption is revealed TO the soul for its conversion; and it is shed abroad IN the regenerate spirit as the mightiest argument of its gratitude.

We have known and believed the love that God hath in us:2 this revelation received by faith was the secret of our return to God. But St. John again and again speaks of this love as perfected in us:3 that is, as accomplishing its perfect triumph over the sin and selfishness of our nature, and its separation from God, which is the secret of all sin and self. In him verily is the love of God perfected:4 this ensures its being individual, and contains the very utmost for which we plead. The love of God, as His mightiest instrument for the sanctification of the spirit of man, is declared to have in him its perfect work. The Verily rebukes our unbelief and encourages our hope 1 1 John 4:19; 2 1 John 4:16; 3 1 John 4:12; 4 1 John 2:5

2. He also speaks most expressly of the return of love to God in us as perfected. This expression occurs but once in the Scripture in so absolutely incontestable a form Whereas in the previous instances the Apostle meant that the love of God is perfected in us, in the following words he can have no other meaning than that our own love is to be, and is—for these are the same, in our argument—itself perfected, teteleioomenee. It is of course the same thing whether God's love is perfected or ours made perfect in return; but the combination gives much force to the statement of privilege: Perfect love casteth out fear. He that feareth is not made perfect in love.1 As St. John is the only writer who says that God is love,2 so he is the only one who speaks of a Christian's perfect love.3 This solitary text, however, gives its meaning to a multitude. It is the last testimony that glorifies all that has gone before 1 1 John 4:18; 2 1 John 4:19; 3 1 John 4:18

3. The Holy Ghost uses the love of God as His instrument in effecting an entire consecration. This is that unction from the Holy One1 which makes us all partakers of the Saviour's consecration, Who received the Spirit not by measure2 for us. As the Supreme Christ was perfectly consecrated in the love of God and man, so it is the privilege of every Christian, who is by his name an image of Christ, to be perfectly consecrated. And there is no limitation of the Spirit's office in the reproduction of the Christly character in us. This was the lesson of that great and notable day of the Lord, the Pentecost. On the morning of that day the Spirit's elect symbol was fire. First He appeared as the Shekinah glory, without a veil, diffused over the whole Church, and then resting upon each. The light which touched every forehead for acceptance entered as fire each heart, and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost:3 filled literally for the time being; and, if we suppose that indwelling permanent, we have our doctrine substantiated. That in this there may be continuance we are taught by St. Paul: be filled with the Spirit.4 Lastly, as a tongue, the symbol signified the sanctification of the outward life of devotion to God and service to man. Hence there is no limit to the Spirit's consecrating grace. I sanctify Myself that they also might be sanctified.5 This is the Saviour's example where it is perfectly imitable: the methods of our sanctification, and its process in the destruction of alien affections, find no pattern in Him; but the result shines clearly in His example. Receiving as in a glass the glory of the Lord, we are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.6 We receive unto perfection the glory which we reflect 1 1 John 2:20; 2 John 3:34; 3 Acts 2:4-5; 4 Ephesians 5:18; 5 John 27:19; 6 2 Corinthians

3:18

III. All this may be said to be the high ideal of Christianity, which has never been realized. But the tenor of the New Testament forbids this method of interpretation in every form. An unbroken, perfect, uninterrupted concentration of all the faculties on God is possible in itself, and it is possible on earth

1. The honor of the Spirit's office requires this. His dispensation is for man in this world; when Christ returns it ceases; and if His perfect work is accomplished it is in the present life. We hear of no operation of His grace save in this world. And the things concerning Him also HAVE AN END.1 He administers to perfection a perfect atonement. On this argument may rest with all its weight the doctrine of the entire destruction of sin from human nature and the full operation of Divine love in the heart. This also is our warrant for introducing the subject in this place. The entire sanctification of believers is deeply connected with Ethics; but it is still more inseparably bound up with the Spirit's Administration: like righteousness and sonship, a gift of grace

1 Luke 22:37

2. The prayers of St. Paul invariably supplicate for Christians in the present state the most abundant outpouring of the love that consecrates. In this they only echo the Lord's own prayer for His people. But they are peculiar, and stand alone in Scripture, as a series of intercessory supplications which set no limits to the Christian privilege. They have been considered in this light already. It is sufficient now to point to the Ephesian Prayer, for instance, containing every element of our doctrine. The Spirit's strength poured into the innerMan 1:1 must needs give victory over all sin and be the energy of an entire consecration, and infuse the power of a perfect holiness. The petition that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith, and that the soul, rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth and length and depth and height and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, can have no lower aim. And to be fitted into all the fullness of God is perfect holiness. The only question is whether the Apostle prays as for an attainable blessing: a question that ought not to be asked 1 Ephesians 3:16-21

3. The nature of man confirms this, and illustrates its possibility. The constitution of the human mind is made for unity, and unity is perfection. But that unity is love: that is, the supreme aim or pursuit of the will is the love which is the bond of perfectness.1 When the faculties of the soul are withdrawn from every other distracting object, and shut up in their concentrated force to one, there remains nothing beyond. For that the Psalmist prayed: Unite my heart to fear Thy name!2 where unity in fear is unity in love; for its Object is the Only Being: Thou art God alone! The ONLY God feared and loved ALONE!

1 Colossians 3:14; 2 Psalms 86:10-11

4. The example of our Lord is so presented as to assure us of the possibility of a perfect love to God and man. In the exercise of that twofold love—one in Him as in no other— He accomplished our redemption. And of this He said: I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done to you.1 The only time our love is spoken of as literally perfect, it is connected with this Supreme Pattern: because as He is, so are we in this world.2 1 John 13:15; 2 1 John 4:17

5. The aspiration of the renewed soul is confirmatory evidence. The argument from aspiration generally is one of the strongest that can be used to move a reasonable mind; it is valid in many departments of theology. In this case it is especially strong. As newborn babes, they long for the spiritual milk;1 and so they desire to love God supremely. No spirit touched with the love of God is content with any hope lower than a perfect love; nor can we believe that the Spirit kindles this fervor in vain. He will satisfy its desire; and that not in the future world but in this. Many of those who most unlovingly oppose this teaching have in their hearts the secret rebuke of their opposition

1 1 Peter 2:2

6. The honor put upon faith is such as to warrant the utmost expectation and sanction the highest doctrine. Thrice did our Lord speak of its unlimited power as a principle living and being enveloped from within like the life of the mustard-seed. As to the uprooting of sin He told His wondering disciples, who prayed for increase of faith, that they might not only overcome un-charitableness, but have its principle extirpated: Ye would say unto this sycamine tree, Be thou plucked up by the root, and be thou planted in the sea; it had obeyed you!1 As to the performance of supernatural duty, represented by the casting out devils, He said on another occasion: Ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you.2 Both are united in the last instance, and something is added: Verily I nay unto you, If ye have faith, and doubt not, ye shall not only do this which is done to the fig tree, but even if ye shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea; it shall be done And all things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive.3 1 Luke 17:6; 2 Matthew 17:20; 3 Matthew 21:21-22

7. The recorded experience and character of the saints should have its weight: their experience; not their testimony, which in the nature of things is not to be expected, as there is no mystery more deeply hid in God, no consciousness more unconscious of self, than that of perfect holiness and love. As to Scriptural examples the express references are few. Not biography, nor delineation of character—save that of One—is to be sought there; men are described only in their relation to the kingdom of God, and their holiness appears only in their lives of devotion. But in every dispensation some names are found to whom the Searcher of hearts bears testimony that they wholly pleased Him. In the judgment of the Christian Church many in almost every community and in every age have been saints made perfect in holiness, and self-renunciation, and charity, whose record is with God. But we are not careful to establish this argument. It is the privilege of the covenant, and not the avowal of it, with which we are here concerned CHRISTIAN OR EVANGELICAL PERFECTION The maturity of the Christian privilege is set before believers as the goal of all Evangelical aspiration. This perfection, as Evangelical and the effect of Divine grace, is estimated according to a gracious interpretation of the law fulfilled in love; moreover, it is limited, and in all respects accommodated to a probationary condition; while it is universal, as extending, under these conditions, to the entire relations of Christian man I. That Perfection is the goal of a possible estate is undeniable

1. It is too common, however, to represent the Spirit as setting before Christians an ideal unattainable in the present life. On this much has been already said, and more will be said hereafter. Suffice to reiterate that no desire of holiness can be vain

2. It is a more reasonable argument to point to passages in which the word has a less intense meaning, though, even when these are given up, there is a large and sufficient residuum of clear testimonies. Doubtless some are incorrectly applied in the discussion: referring rather to the perfection with which Christianity begins than to that with which it ends. Let us, therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded.1 We speak wisdom among them that are perfect.2 These, and some others, refer to the perfect beginning or initiation of the soul into Christian mystery, in contrast with the preliminary knowledge of babes: leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection.3 They do not touch our point: that perfection is a promised goal. Similarly Be perfect!4 kataritzesthe, may refer to ecclesiastical integrity. And of this ambiguous nature are some other applications of the term in the English translation especially: for instance, He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified,5 which refers rather to the objective perfection of the atoning provision, and is language that anticipates the eternal future 1 Php 3:15; 2 1 Corinthians 2:6; 3 Hebrews 6:1; 4 2 Corinthians 13:11; 5 Hebrews 10:14 3. Injunctions to seek perfection and corresponding promises are few but very distinct Were there no other the Redeemer's would be enough: Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.1 This, like many other words of our Lord, has a present limited signification which must be fearlessly expanded into the largest generality

1 Matthew 5:48

II. This perfection is Evangelical: that is, it is distinguished from every kind of perfection that is not of pure grace; and it bears, like everything pertaining to the estate of humanity, the impress of the condescension and lovingkindness of God. It is, however much the thought may be disapproved of men, a perfection accommodated to our fallen condition: not lowered but accommodated; a distinction this which is not without a difference. There is a consummation here as well as hereafter

1. It is not absolute perfection; nor the perfection of Adam's estate, who had not fallen; nor the perfection of sinlessness, which can never be predicated of those who will bear in them the consequences of sin until the end. Those who are unsinning in the gracious estimate of God, neither think themselves, nor desire to be thought, sinless in the utmost meaning of the word

2. It is the perfection of that estate to which men are called by the Gospel of glad tidings: glad tidings, not only as to the remission of past sins, but also as to the acceptance of future service. Applying this to the threefold division of that estate, we may note: (1.) The righteousness of God, which He accepts, is regarded as a fulfillment of the law, as that is fulfilled in love: love is the fulfilling of the law;1 (2.) we are children of God and conformed to the image of HisSong of Solomon 2:1-17 though many infirmities are in us which could not be in Him; (3.) we are described, in the prayer of the Apostle, as sanctified wholly throughout spirit, and soul, and body, and preserved blameless;3 though the spirit is still beclouded with ignorance and weakness, the soul is under the influence of sensible things, and the body is on the way to dissolution. Such a threefold perfection may be traced elsewhere 1 Romans 13:10; 2 Romans 8:29; 3 1 Thessalonians 5:23

3. This being understood, the doctrine is not disparaged by the use of the expression itself. The word PERFECTIONISM is sometimes applied satirically to those who hold the doctrine we here maintain: they who bear it bear in it the reproach of Christ. The term Perfection, being alone, should not be adopted without qualification; but with its guardian adjectives CHRISTIAN or

EVANGELICAL it is unimpeachable. It is the vanishing point of every doctrine, exhortation, promise, and prophecy in the New Testament III. Christian perfection is relative and probationary, and therefore in a certain perhaps undefinable sense limited

1. This may be viewed with reference to the final consummation. In the hope of that last teteleseai all Christians unite: when HOLINESS TO THE LORD1 shall be the eternal law of the glorified man in his integrity. In this life, the body is dead became of sin:2 it not only perisheth itself, but, in the language of the Apocryphal Wisdom, the corruptible body presseth down the soul, and the earthly tabernacle weigheth down the mind that museth upon many things. Christian perfection is the estate of a spirit every whit whole, but still in a body the infirmity of which is the main part of its probation. Each has its own order With regard to physical resurrection St. Paul says: That was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural.3 This order is inverted as to the resurrection of the soul: first that which is spiritual. But when the perfection of the soul is reached, the body has still to submit to the dust: the spiritual eye sees the King in His beauty4... in the land that is very far off; the natural eye goes down to see corruption.5 And the body on its way to dissolution impairs in ten thousand ways the absoluteness of the deliverance of the spirit Perfection under this and every aspect is relative 1 Zechariah 14:20; 2 Romans 8:10; 3 1 Corinthians 15:46; 4 Isaiah 33:17; 5 Psalms 16:10

2. Christian perfection at the best is that of a probationary estate. There is no reason therefore why it may not be lost again, and utterly lost, even after the fruition of the result of long years of heavenly blessing on earthly diligence. The principle of sin extinct in the soul may be kindled into life as it was kindled in Eve. There is no reason why it should not; but there is every reason why it need not and ought not. Such a second fall would be a fall indeed. It is not probable that it was ever witnessed. It is only our theory that demands the admission of its possibility

3. It is that of the individual person whose relation to the race remains. Though personally in Christ, and altogether in Christ, during probation he is still under the generic doom of original sin, with a concupiscence which is not sin but the fuel of it always ready to be kindled, and generally under that law of probation which is peculiar to our race. Hence he is also a sinner among sinful men to the end of his continuance in the flesh: the inheritor of a sinful nature which, cleansed in himself, he transmits to his own children uncleansed. He does not altogether lose his connection with the line of sinful humanity. We never read of an entire severance from the first Adam as the prerogative of those who are found in the Second. The entirely sanctified believer may be, as touching his relation to Christ and in Christ, without spot and blameless; at the same time that in relation to Adam and in him he is only a sinful man among sinful men

4. Once more, it is a probationary perfection inasmuch as it is always under the ethical law. Christianity is the perfect law of liberty:1 its perfection is that it is the liberty of law, the freest possible obligation and the most bounden and necessary freedom, It is a state to be guarded by watchfulness, which is subjected to an infinite variety of tests, and must be maintained by the habitual and, by Divine grace, perfect exercise of all the virtues active and passive. On the one hand it is a state of rest: filled with the Spirit2 the Christian can say, I can do all things through Christ which strengthened me.3 On the other it is a state in which the soul is safe only in the highest exercise of the severest virtue. To its safety its sedulity is required. In this respect it is very different from the perfection of heaven or even of paradise 1 James 1:25; 2 Ephesians 5:18; 3 Php

4:13

5. Hence this perfection needs constantly the mediatorial work of Christ: it demands His constant influence to preserve as a state what is imparted as a gift. The mediatory intercession is never so urgently needed as for those who have so priceless a treasure in earthen vessels: the higher the grace and the more finished the sanctity, the more alien it is from the surrounding world, the more hateful to the tempter, and the more grace does it require for its guard. Our Lord's rehearsal of His abiding intercession tells us this: I pray not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from the evil.1

1 John 17:15

6. With all these conditions and limitations the word perfection—teleiotees, integrity— extends to all the blessings of the covenant of grace as they are provided for man in probation. In other words these several blessings are perfect in their imperfection: imperfect, when viewed in relation to the eternal requirement of the Supreme Lawgiver; perfect, when viewed in relation to the present economy of grace. (1.) In the judicial court of the Gospel the believer is or may be perfect in his relation to the law. By one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified:1 absolution from guilt is as complete as it could be in heaven: FOR EVER.2 And so is the requirement of the law fulfilled3 that believers may have boldness in the day of judgment,4 boldness that will never be experienced at the awful bar unless it is carried thither. (2.) As children of God their state lacks nothing: though waiting for the adoption as to its final declaration and prerogative, now are we the sons of God: and they are conformed to the image of HisSong of Solomon 5:1-16 being blameless and harmless, the sons of God without rebuke,6 in the theory, and why not in the practice, of religion? (3.) And in the temple of God, of which it is said that holiness becometh Thine house, 0 Lord,

7 the perfection of Christianity requires and reaches such a purity and simplicity as can endure the scrutiny of the Searcher of hearts. Thou hast tried me, and shalt find nothing.8 This is the sixth benediction, Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.9 The vision of God belongs to the consummate sanctity of the temple, whether on earth or in heaven; and the Savior makes no such distinction as we in our unbelief are too much disposed to make

1 Hebrews 10:14; 2 Romans 8:4; 3 1 John 4:17; 4 1 John 3:1; 5 Romans 8:29; 6 Php 2:15; 7 Psalms 93:5; 8 Psalms 17:3; 9 Matthew 5:8

HISTORICAL

Though the specific doctrine thus laid down is very generally condemned among the Churches, some kind of Christian Perfection has been held in every age: held not only by the orthodox, but also by many heretical sectaries. The diverse principles which have contributed to mould opinion may be very profitably studied as shedding light upon the Scriptural doctrine. Indeed their respective views on this subject may be regarded as among the most searching tests which can be applied to the various systems. Every great theological tendency of the Christian world has had its own peculiar exhibition of it. As there is no consecutive history of the doctrine—it has no place in Histories of Doctrine generally—it may be well to adopt a method not chronological in this brief review: considering the theories of Christian Perfection which may be distinguished as the Fanatical, the Ascetic, and the Pelagian, the Mystical, the Romanist, the Imputationist, the

Arminian, and finally the Methodist: this last returning to that which we shall place first in order as the continuation in the Church of the Scriptural doctrine. These, however, will be given merely in outline, and with the proviso that Christian Ethics is the more appropriate place for some of them, especially of the earlier members of the series

I. The Christian Perfection taught in the Scriptures has descended as a sacred uninterrupted tradition through all Christian ages. Testimonies might be gathered from the writers of every period—a true CATENA AUREA—proving that the Spirit of finished holiness has never left Himself without witness. The essentials of the doctrine have been preserved, though with many minor differences, from the beginning, clearly discernible through all the ascetic, fanatical, ultra-mystical, semi-Pelagian veils which have obscured them

1. The Apostolical Fathers, the common heritage of Christianity, continued the strain of the New Testament, and taught their successors not to shrink from the application of the term. So Clemens Romanus: " Those who have been perfected in love, through the grace of God, attain to the place of the godly in the fellowship of those who in all ages have served the glory of God in perfectness." Similarly, Polycarp, speaking of faith, hope, and charity, says: "If any man be in these, he has fulfilled the law of righteousness, for he that has love is far from every sin." Such words as these contain the germ of what may be called the doctrine of Christian Perfection: it is the perfection of love through grace accomplishing the righteousness of faith. The Epistles of Ignatius again and again speak of a perfect faith, of a perfect mind and intention, and of the perfect work of holiness: teleioi ontes, teleia kai phroneite• Thelousi gar uooin eu prattein, kai ho Theos etoimos estin eis to paraschein. With these we may connect Irenaeus, who says that "God is mighty to make that perfect which the willing spirit desires," and "the Apostle calls them perfect who present body, soul, and spirit without blame before God: who not only have the Holy Spirit abiding in them, but also preserve faultless their souls and bodies, keeping their fidelity to God, and fulfilling their duties to their neighbor." 2. But it soon became evident that the high tone of New-Testament teaching was more or less lowered in Christian literature. For this three reasons may be assigned: first, the recoil from the assumptions of the Gnostics, and other fanatics; secondly, the introduction of an undue asceticism; and, thirdly, the spread of Pelagian error. The effect of these three causes respectively will be given in their order of development

II. From the Ascetic must be distinguished the fanatical theories of Perfection which have been among the saddest developments of Christian error. The adage, Corruptio optimi pessima, has here one of its most deplorable illustrations

1. Gnosticism led the way, and found its best opponent in Clemens Alexandrinus. He lays down a high doctrine of Christian Perfection, but recoils from the pride of these Fanatics: "I cannot but sometimes wonder that some men dare to call themselves perfect and Gnostics, thinking of themselves more highly than the Apostle did." He refers here the pride of knowledge. But elsewhere he says: "A man may be perfected, whether as godly, or as patient, or in chastity, or in labors, or as a martyr, or in knowledge. But to be perfected in all these together I know not if this may be said of any who is yet man, save only of Him who put on humanity for us. Who therefore is the perfect man? He who professes abstinence from all evils." This negative abstinence from sin he, however, strengthens into positive fulfillment of righteousness: "It is a thing impossible that man should be perfect as God is perfect; but it is the Father’s will that we, living according to the

Gospel in blameless or unfailing obedience, should become perfect." This wavering language, holding fast the doctrine of Scriptural Perfection and yet shrinking from the full statement of it, may in Clement, Irenaeus, and others, be fairly ascribed to a certain failure of their faith in their own principles. The Gnostics claimed to be the spiritual and perfect, as being redeemed from the bondage of matter and the flesh. The answer to them should have been that believers are, or may be, sanctified in the flesh as well as from the flesh. But this grand principle was surrendered, and Christian men were content to write as if sin was a necessary concomitant of the body

2. Montanism in the second century was a system based on the delusion that the Holy Ghost, as the Paraclete, was not given to the Apostles but was reserved for a third dispensation. Montanus claimed, to be the prophet or apostle of this new revelation, which raised the Church to a higher perfection, and made its true members the Spiritales or Pneumatici, whereas before they were only Psychici, or the Carnal. This enthusiast aimed rather at a stricter external discipline than at the establishment of any systematic doctrine of personal sanctification, and therefore his fanaticism only in an indirect way concerns our present subject. But its fundamental principle, that the Spirit may be expected to descend for a fuller and deeper baptism than on the Day of Pentecost, has from time to time reappeared in theories of the perfectibility of Christian faith and Christian experience

3. Montanism was the first development of a principle which has reappeared at various times under other influences. Many of the fanatical sects of the Patristic and Middle Ages boasted of a plenary outpouring of the Spirit vouchsafed to themselves alone. Adopting the language of Scripture which speaks of the teleioi, or the Perfect, some of the Catharists of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries termed themselves the PERFECTI in contradistinction from the general body of Credentes or believers. They were wont to speak of their company as the Boni Homines or Consolati. But it has always been found that those who have perverted the term Perfect into a designation of themselves have been Antinomian in their spirit and practice. The Fraticelli, the Brethren of the Free Spirit, in the Middle Ages, the Catharist Perfecti, the Fanatics who were known during the Commonwealth as Perfectionists and more recently in America, have all been under the delusion of a principle which elevated them above the moral law. The fanatical abuse of the term has tended to bring the phrase Christian Perfection into discredit. The assumption of a claim to this perfection, and especially the use of the name, the healthy sentiment of Christianity condemns. But this should not be used in argument against the doctrine itself of a possible deliverance from sin. And the honest opponents of the doctrine ought to be cautious of branding those who hold it, but not claiming the title, with the name of Perfectionists

4. There has been a tendency among some teachers of religion in modern times so to speak of Christian perfection as to seem to make it the entrance into a new order of life, one namely of higher consecration under the influence of the Holy Ghost. That this higher life is the secret of entire consecration there can be no doubt. But there is no warrant in Scripture for making it a new dispensation of the Spirit, or a Pentecostal visitation super-added to the state of conversion. Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? means Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed?1 In other words entire consecration is the stronger energy of a Spirit already in the regenerate, not a Spirit to be sent down from on high. This kingdom of God is already within, if we would let it come in its perfection. Neither SINCE in this passage, nor the AFTER in after that ye believed,2 has anything corresponding in the original Greek. The teaching tends to diminish the

value of regeneration, which is itself a life hid with Christ in God;3 and it undoubtedly has some affinity with the ancient principle of Montanism; just as, on the other hand, the assertors of a necessary inherence of sin until death betray a lurking and most subtle affinity with Gnosticism. But the spirit of the teachers to whom reference is made is far from being fanatical; they have the highest and the purest aims, and need only to guard their doctrine more carefully 1 Acts 19:2; 2 Ephesians 1:13; 3 Colossians 3:3

5. A certain fanaticism of devout ignorance has in every age led enthusiasts to mistake transient effusions of heavenly influence for a finished work of holiness. This error, venial in one sense but very hurtful in another, is the result of a too prevalent separation between the sanctification of Christian privilege as a free gift and the ethical means appointed for its attainment. Sometimes it springs from forgetting that the present posture of the soul is a very different thing from its abiding character. Opponents of the Scriptural doctrine make much use of a fact which must be admitted, that religious enthusiasm often outruns discretion. But the fact, however lamentable, has no force as argument

III. Asceticism is a development of the religious tendency in man that has been almost universal and has the highest sanction

1. Its definition is given by St. Paul in words which at once recommend it and guard it and promise its genuine fruit: Exercise thyself rather unto godliness.1 (1.) Timothy is exhorted to make his religion matter of personal thought, care, discipline: gumnaze de seauton. Therefore the soul must not be surrendered to Divine influence with a passive quietude. Neither at the outset, nor during the continuance, nor in the highest reaches, of the religious life is the careful study of the arts of perfection needless. (2.) Asceticism is guarded and protected from every error: pros EUSEBEIAN, unto godliness. Bodily exercise profiteth little: there are advantages in the rules of religious life; but they must be such as tend to godliness, which includes and indeed is the total suppression of pride, vainglory, personal sense of meritoriousness, exultation in external religion, and morbid selfanatomy (3.) Godliness is the reward of this discipline, even as it must be its end

Therefore Christian perfection, which is the perfect operation of the Holy Spirit in the heart and life, requires on its human side a certain askoosis, or personal strenuous exercise. St. Paul said of himself, I exercise myself to have always a conscience void of offence toward God and toward men.2 The word is different, autos askoo, but the thought is the same as in the injunction to Timothy. In both a pure asceticism is commended 1 1 Timothy 4:7; 2 Acts 24:16

2. "What may be called ascetical theories of Perfection are to be traced in every age. As they have expressed the most intense strivings of the Christian devotion they must be treated with respect. But in their general tendency they have declined from the spirit of the New Testament, and that in two ways: (1.) They have laid too much stress on the human effort, thereby dishonoring the supremacy of the Holy Ghost, Who carries on His work without the instrumentality too often adopted by asceticism, and is after all the sole Agent in the spirit’s sanctification

Doubtless, many of those who abstracted themselves from the world for the attainment of perfect holiness depended on the grace of the Gospel for acceptance, but many more sought by the merit of their works to win that grace. And, generally, the direct influence of the Spirit in the extinction of sin through the shedding abroad of the love of God was not the prime element in their ascetic

discipline

(2.) They have too carefully distinguished between common and elect Christians by adopting the Saviour's so-called COUNSELS OF PERFECTION as the guide to a higher life interdicted to those who do not receive these counsels. CHASTITY, POVERTY, and OBEDIENCE are the three-one estate of perfection, as exemplified by our Lord Himself, to which, it has been assumed, He called the more elect among His followers. But our Lord did not summon some men to a perfection denied to others, though He did summon some men to duties not required in all cases of others. To all His disciples the injunction came to aspire to another three-one perfection: if any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow Me.1 These three are imposed on every Christian without exception

1 Luke 9:23

3. The noblest testimonies to the grandeur of the Christian vocation are found in the writings of the early anchorets; but the influence of an undue stress upon human effort qualifies the value of the best even of those who do most honor to the Spirit's work. The thought for ever lingers in their pages that something must remain for human vigilance to watch and keep down, without which humility would not be perfect

(1.) Macarius, of Egypt, is a typical example. One extract will show his precise relation to the question: " Such souls as burn with ardent and inextinguishable love to the Lord are worthy of eternal life. Hence they are thought meet to be free from such motions of the mind, and to attain perfect enlightenment, and the hidden Communion of the Holy Ghost, and the mysterious fellowship of the fullness of grace." " It is the Spirit who gives him this, teaching him true prayer, true meekness, which he had long sought and labored for; and then he grows, and becomes perfect in God, and worthy to be an heir of the kingdom." Here the note of worthiness is a subtle fall, if not from the language yet from the spirit of Scripture. Again: " Every one of us must attain blessedness through the gift of the Holy Spirit. But he may in faith and love and the struggle of the determination of his free will reach a perfect degree of virtue, that so he may both by grace and by righteousness win eternal life. Thus not alone by the Divine grace and power, without the diligence of his own labor being added, is he counted worthy of perfect growth. Nor again only through his own diligence, as if not laying hold of the Divine hand from above, does he reach perfect freedom and purity." And what is that purity? " Answer: the perfect cleansing from sin, and freedom from base passions, And the attainment of the highest reach of virtue,' that is, the sanctification of the heart, which takes place through the indwelling of the Divine and perfect Spirit of God in perfect joy" And even this is not the highest pitch of Macarius; but he descends again: " Never have I seen a Christian man perfect and entirely free. For though one may be resting in grace, and may attain to mysteries and revelations, and to much and deep sweetness of grace: nevertheless, he has sin within him. They think through the abounding grace and light they have that they are free and perfect: deceived by inexperience, even while they receive much grace. I have yet seen no man entirely free. I myself may have reached that point sometimes, but have learned still that no man is perfect." " In the case of a man that is sick, it may be that some members are sound; for instance, the sight or other organs. So is it in spiritual things. For it is probable that some may have all the three members of the spirit sound, but not on that account is he perfect." It is obvious that the central idea is here wanting, that the Spirit's operation is within the various elements of our nature,

mighty in the personality itself, and that His supreme prerogative is to kill that body of sin the members of which we are to mortify. The Ascetic theory has always rested in the contest between the human spirit and the flesh: too often forgetting that the Divine Spirit is not merely the umpire and witness but the Almighty Agent also in the destruction of sin

(2.) Many high testimonies were borne to the Saviour's power in the inner man by Nilus, a Greek disciple or representative of Asceticism in the fifth century. " Our Lord Christ can not only scatter and make powerless the temptations which come upon us through Satan from without, but He can also restrain and still the motions and impulses which lie deep in our corrupted nature." His teaching is, that if we give heed to purity of heart, and watch its bias, by grace "all its lusts and abominations shall be extirpated from the soul by its very roots; and joy, confidence, knowledge of ourselves and of sin be brought in, with true humility and great love to God and man." But Nilus knows nothing of a perfect destruction of sin in the heart: " When thou art assailed by evil lust, fall down before God and cry, O Son of God, help me! But do not over mightily trouble thyself, for we fight only with affections, but cannot entirely root them out." Marcus Eremita speaks for the whole class when he says: " There may have been unspeakable heavenly glories enjoyed

It might seem that a perfect stage had been reached, and that the man was pure and free from sin itself. But afterwards that special grace was withdrawn, and the veil over the deadly evil removed, though the man still remained in a lower degree of perfection." As also Maximus: " Devotion indeed sets the will free from lusts, yet so that its nature, as will, does not fail. Think not that thou hast an entire deliverance from concupiscence, because the object is not now present: that would only be if thou shouldst remain immoveable on the remembrance or at the presence of the object. But even so thou must not be too secure, because devotion may for a long season kill the desires which yet afterwards rise again if strong devotion is suspended." This is in harmony with the uniform tendency of Ascetic writers of every age to regard concupiscence as a secret enemy in the soul left there for the discipline, humiliation, and caution of the spiritual athlete. Two sentences of the same saint may be collated: " No man may make the weakness of the flesh the patron of his sins because union with God the Word has abolished the curse, and made it inexcusable if we still, with evil concupiscence, cling to sinful objects. For the Divinity of the Word, always present by grace with the believer, makes weak the law of sin in the flesh." With this compare: "The end of godliness is the union of human weakness with Divine strength through the true wisdom. Now he who through the weakness of nature limits himself does not reach the goal of virtue, but lets his hands fall short of the strength that is afforded to our weakness. He has only his own sloth to blame that he is not better than he is." There is but a step between such views as these and the Scriptural truth that the Divine strength not only aids but is perfected in our weakness. That step, however, was never taken by the Ascetic theory

(3.) Cassian, in his Conferences on the Holy Life, gives perhaps the best examples of the dignity and the defect of the Ascetic aspiration. These must be consulted by the student himself

IV. The most radical error of ancient times in relation to grace, in its perfection as well as in its processes, was Pelagianism. What the heresy of Arius was to Christ's Person, that of Pelagius was to His work 1. No tenet was more logically necessary to the system than that of a possible perfectibility of human nature: the strongest argument was that no reason existed to the contrary. It taught that man's free will might be educated, and had been educated in many instances, up to

such a pitch of conformity with the moral law as would satisfy the merciful Governor of mankind. But the highest law was low in a theory which made forgiveness possible without expiation; and regarded sin merely as the temporary and accidental condition of the mind, resulting from bad example, which a strong exercise of will could at any time correct The importance of the Pelagian controversy in its bearing on this subject will justify a fuller statement of the views of the heresiarch and of his opponent Augustine

(1.) The following gives the pith of the doctrine of Pelagius as to human perfectibility: " Ante omnia interrogandus est qui negat hominem sine peccato esse posse, quid sit quodcunque peccatum, quod vitari potest, an quod vitari nori potest. Si quod vitari non potest, peccatum non est; si quod vitari potest, potest homo sine peccato esse quod vitari potest . . .. Iterum quaerendum est peccatum voluntatis an necessitatis est. Si necessitatis est, peccatum non est; si voluntatis est, vitari potest . . .. Iterum quaerendum est, utrumne debeat homo sine peccato esse. Procul dubio debet. Si debet, potest; si non potest, ergo nec debet; et si nec debet homo esse sine peccato, debet ergo cum peccato esse; et jam peccatum non erit, si illud debere constiterit. Aut si hoc etiam dici absurdum est, confiteri necesse est debere hominem sine peccato esse, et constat eum non aliud debere quam potest . . .. Iterum quaerendum est quomodo non potest homo sine peccato esse, voluntate an natura. Si natura, peccatum non est; si voluntate, perfacile potest voluntas voluntate mutari." Here the possibility of Christian perfection is based on the broad ground of the essential power of the human will. Hence Pelagius boldly asserted that through the use of their natural faculties, and the natural means of grace, men might attain unto a state of perfect conformity with the law of God, Who prescribes nothing impossible. But his denial of original sin, and of the sanctifying power of the Holy Ghost applying the provision of the Atonement, robbed his theory of entire sanctification of any essentially Christian character (2.) The views of Augustine on this subject deserve careful consideration. It will appear from the following extracts that he was not an opponent of the doctrine of entire sanctification, and that his statements on this subject were much more faithful to Scripture than those of his followers in the maintenance of what are called by them the Doctrines of Grace. He admits, in fact, that through a supernatural operation of grace the will might be so influenced as to concur with the will of God in all things. He asserts that a supreme delight in God might overcome every opposite tendency: this being the doctrine of Perfect Love which we have maintained. That he afterwards denies the fact, or seems to deny the fact, that God has given this grace to any, does not weaken his admission; since he arbitrarily attributes the restraint to the secret wisdom of the Divine procedure, a principle to which we shall return. " Et ideo ejus perfectionem etiam in hac vita esse possibilem, negare non possumus, quia omnia possibilia sunt Deo, sive quae facit sola sua voluntate, sive quae co-operantibus creaturae suae voluntatibus a se fieri posse con-stituit. Ac per hoc quicquid eorum non facit, sine exemplo est quidem in ejus operibus factis; sed apud Deum et in ejus virtute habet causam qua fieri possit, et in ejus sapientia quare non factum sit." Here are the two factors in entire sanctification, plainly stated, " the power of God in accomplishing whatsoever He has determined to do with the co-operation of His creatures' faculties." If there is any bar to the finished holiness of the believer, it must be found in the "wisdom of God." In the next passage we receive in Augustine's striking antithetical phrases, a luminous statement of our doctrine. It is the " revelation of all that belongs to righteousness," and " the victory of the soul's delight over every impediment." But here the wisdom of God's appointment, which might forbid perfect holiness, becomes His "judgment." "Ecce quemadmodum sine exemplo est in homini-bus perfecta justitia, et tamen impossibilis non est.

Fieret enim si tanta voluntas adhiberetur quanta sufficit tantae rei. Esset autem tanta, si et nihil eorum quae pertinent ad justitiam nos lateret, et ea sic delectarent animum, ut quicquid aliud voluptatis dolorisve impedit, delectatio ilia superaret: quod ut non sit, non ad impossibilitatem, sed ad judicium Dei pertinet." In the quotation now to be added an element is introduced which was wanting before, the extinction of the law of sin in the members: " Sed inveniant isti, si possunt, aliquem sub onere corruptionis hujus viventem, cui jam non habeat Deus quod ignoscat . . .. Sane quemquam talem, si testimonia ilia divina competenter accipiant, prorsus invenire non possunt; nullo modo tamen dicendum, Deo deesse possibilitatem, qua voluntas sic adjuvetur humana, ut non solum justitia ista quae ex fide est, omni ex parte modo perficiatur in homine, verum etiam ilia secundum quam postea in aeternum in ipsa ejus contemplatione vivendum est Quandoquidem, si nunc veiit in quoquam etiam hoc corruptibili induere incorrup-tionem, atque hic inter homines morituros eum jubere vivere minime moriturum, ut tota penitus vetustate consumpta nulla lex in membris ejus repugnet legi mentis, Deumque ubique praesentem ita cognoscat, sicut sancti postea cognituri sunt; quis demum audeat affirmare, non posse ? Sed quare non faciat quaerunt homines, nee qui quaerunt se attendunt esse homines." The substance of this is, that no one should dare to say that God cannot destroy the original sin in the members, and make Himself so present to the soul that, "TOTA PENITUS VETUSTATE CONSUMPTA," the old nature being entirely abolished, a life should be lived below as life will be lived in the eternal contemplation of Him above. But then the Saint once more draws back from the legitimate conclusions of his sagacious faith, and he adds, that those who ask why it is not so do not remember that they are men. The arguments relied on by Augustine to confirm to himself the conviction which he reluctantly held, are those which have been urged by many from his time to our own. First, he repudiates the thought that perfect holiness is in man’s power, and asserts "MUNUS esse Divinum," and therefore "OPUS esse Divinum:" in this all confessions agree. The doctrine we have laid down from Scripture makes entire sanctification a WORK of the Holy Ghost, whose FUNCTION is this in the administration of grace. Secondly, he refers to the consentient testimony of all saints, who in their humility confess that they are sinners. But he overthrows his argument by a certain hesitation about the Virgin Mary; and forgets, as all his followers forget, that the wholly sanctified still bear in their mind before God their sinful character by nature and practice, and confess their forgiven sins to the end. Thirdly, he insists much upon the undoubted truth that humility is part of the very perfection we speak of. "Ex hoc factum est, virtutem quae nunc est in homine justo, perfectum hactenus nominari, ut ad ejus perfectionem pertineat etiam ipsius imperfectionis et in veritate cognitio, et in humilitate confessio. Tune enim est secundum hanc infirmitatem pro suo modulo perfecta ista parva justitia, quando etiam quid sibi desit intelligit, Ideoque Apostolus et imperfectum et perfectum se dicit." These last words which make St. Paul confess his imperfection have nothing to do with the matter, for he spoke only of his aspiration towards his perfect consummation in soul and body, when he should in the resurrection win and apprehend Christ in all His fullness. As to the argument that a sense of imperfection is part of entire perfection none can deny that, against Pelagianism, it holds good for ever; but, standing alone, the assertion is not true: the saints in heaven will have no sense of imperfection. True it is however that human perfection is based upon humility, and clothed with it as a garment; and that the entirely sanctified ascribe all to the grace of God and nothing to themselves, never professing that they are perfect, though daring to glory in the perfecting of Divine grace in themselves.

But, lastly, the strength and the weakness of St. Augustine’s argument is this, that the will of God permits and appoints the continuance of sin for the discipline of the soul. "Idcirco etiam sanctos et fideles suos in aliquibus vitiis tardius sanat, ut in eos minus, quam implendae ex omni parte justitiae sufficit, delectet bonum." This tremendous plea sounds Very much like continuing in sin that grace might abound; against which the Christian sentiment protests with its GOD FORBID! He whose will is our sanctification cannot " cure our sin slowly so that the delight in good should be less than sufficient for all righteousness." The argument rests upon St. Augustine’s general theory of sin, which he regards, as we have seen elsewhere, as a defect that in the Divine scheme works a greater good. Its force in relation to our present subject is arrested and almost neutralized by words which follow: " nec in eo ipso vult nos damnabiles esse sed humiles." Carried out to its strict conclusion, this admission establishes one of the cardinal points of our doctrine, that the infirmities of the saints, into which their will enters not, are not counted for condemnation, though they ensure and deepen true humility. On the whole it will be evident that the Father of the predestinarian system of Grace approved with his mind the highest doctrine of Christian perfection as a privilege of the Christian covenant, but that he was fettered by a false interpretation of certain sayings of Scripture, and by an excessive dread of Pelagianism which gave the law to that interpretation

(3.) Some modern tendencies, originating in America, may be alluded to, which belong partly to the Pelagian and partly to the semi-Pelagian school. They are represented by the Oberlin doctrine of entire sanctification: " a full and perfect discharge of our entire duty, of all existing obligations to God, and all other beings. It is perfect obedience to the moral law." Hence on this theory the moral law is relaxed, though the expression is demurred to, in sheer justice. We cannot love God as we should have loved Him had not sin entered the world and diminished our power. But God expects from every man only the best he can do with his impaired faculties. It is obvious that on this theory Christian perfection is too much a subjective matter, and varies with every individual. Moreover, the view of original sin on which it is based is one that does not permit the thought of such an innate bias to evil as must be negatively eradicated. Its active and positive principle of perfection is that of perfect disinterested benevolence, or the ultimate choice of the welfare of all being. This, perfect at any moment, makes the man perfect. But the character profoundly impressed on the soul is not taken enough into account. And, to sum up, the essential Pelagianism of the Oberlin teaching on original sin, as exhibited in Finney’s System of Theology, counteracts the good in its semi-Pelagian enforcement of the necessity of Divine grace

2. Semi-Pelagianism, the main error of which was its ascribing to human nature, notwithstanding the Fall, the power of seeking God and thus claiming Divine help by a kind of meritum de congruo, did not teach a subsequent Christian perfection attainable without special grace. Its first representatives were men who set up a very high standard of Christian perfection as attainable through the help of the Spirit. They were confused as to the relation of Divine grace to the freedom of the will in man before conversion, laying the stress rather on the power of human co-operation than upon the universal prevenient grace of the Holy Ghost, restored in virtue of redemption. That error was partially, though only partially, corrected in the Synergism of one section of Lutheran theology; it was entirely removed in later Arminian and Methodist teaching. Mediaeval discussions, and the Romanist standards shaped by them, retained the confusion as it respects the first accesses of grace. That was ascribed to the remainder of good left in the Fall which ought to have been ascribed to the influence of the Holy Ghost given back to the race. If we suppose this error

corrected—an error rather of phraseology than of fact—then semi- Pelagianism differs little from the truth taught by all who hold a universal redemption And its teaching as to Christian Perfection flows into the general stream of the Mystical and Roman Catholic doctrine to which we now pass

V. The central idea of Mysticism in all its varieties has been the entire consecration of the spirit of man to God, in absolute detachment from the creature and perfect union with the Creator

1. In its purest form, Mysticism proper has in every age moulded an interior circle of earnest souls, seeking the innermost mysteries of the kingdom of grace by the most strenuous ethical discipline. Its methods have been from time immemorial described as, first, the way of PURIFICATION; secondly, the way of ILLUMINATION; thirdly, the way of UNION. These may be considered as answering respectively to the Evangelical doctrines of Purification from sin, the Consecration of the Spirit, and the estate of Holiness in abstraction from self and earthly things in fellowship with God. A careful study of St John's First Epistle will find in it laid the sure and deep foundations of this better Mysticism. It gives the three principles in their order. The blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin:1 this is the mystical Purgation. Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things,2 that is, for the practical regulation of the life: this is the mystical Illumination. He that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him:3 this is the perfect Union. A true Mysticism may be traced in almost every community; and, wherever found, has taught directly or indirectly the perfection to which the Spirit of God raises the spirit of man, blending in its pursuit contemplation and action: contemplation, which is faith waiting passively for the highest energy of the Holy Ghost; and action, which works out His holy will. How high its doctrine, scarcely falling below the highest, might be proved by examples taken from the leading Mystics of every type and of every community 1 1 John 1:7; 2 1 John 2:20; 3 1 John 4:16

2. Mediating between this highest type and its subsequent perversions is the doctrine of the Quakers, who are among the best representatives of modern Mysticism. It is thus stated by Barclay: "For though we judge so of the best works performed by man, endeavoring a conformity with the outward law by his own strength, and in his own will, yet we believe that such works as naturally proceed from this spiritual birth and formation of Christ in us are pure and holy, even as the root from whence they come; and therefore God accepts them, justifies us in them, and rewards us for them in His own free grace . . .. Wherefore their judgment is false and against the truth who says that the holiest works of the saints are defiled and sinful in the sight of God. For these good works are not the works of the law excluded by the Apostle from justification." In the following extract the new birth is regarded as a developing process, and is not sufficiently distinguished from the sanctification of the life that is imparted in it. This may, however, be conformed to St. John's doctrine of a birth of God, with which all sin is incompatible For the rest, the true teaching of Scripture is clearly stated. " In whom this pure and holy birth is fully brought forth, the body of death and sin comes to be crucified and removed; and their hearts united and subjected to the truth; so as not to obey any suggestions or temptations of the Evil One, and to be free from actual sinning and transgressing of the law of God, and in that respect perfect. Yet doth this perfection still admit of a growth; and there remaineth always in some part a possibility of sinning, where the mind doth not most diligently and watchfully attend unto the Lord." "Although this gift and inward grace of God be sufficient to work out salvation, yet in those in whom it is resisted it both may and doth become their condemnation. Moreover, they in whose hearts it hath wrought in part to purify and sanctify them in order to their further perfection, may by disobedience

fall from it, turn to wantonness (Jude 1:4); make shipwreck of faith (1 Timothy 1:19); and, after having tasted of the heavenly gift, and been made partakers of the Holy Ghost, again fall away (Hebrews 6:4-6). Yet such an increase and stability in the truth may in this life be attained, from which there can be no total apostasy." The Apologist can adduce no passage for this last statement, which however is a venial one. Although he nowhere expressly teaches that the evil of our nature may be absolutely eradicated, yet his general principle leads that way; for instance, in another place we read: " The first is the redemption performed and accomplished by Christ for us in His crucified body without us; the other is the redemption wrought by Christ in us, which no less properly is called and accounted a redemption than the former. The first, then, is that whereby a man, as he stands in the Fall, is put into a capacity of salvation, and hath conveyed unto him a measure of that power, virtue, spirit, life and grace that was in Christ Jesus, which, as the free gift of God, is able to counterbalance, overcome, and root out the evil seed wherewith we are naturally, as in the Fall, leavened." This is a noble testimony, which, in its last sentence, goes beyond the general strain of Mysticism, and anticipates the doctrine we have maintained

3. False or impure Mysticism, which came from the East through Neo-Platonism and ran into the Middle Ages, stimulated the trembling spirit to seek an uncreaturely identification with the Uncreated, after the manner of the Buddhist Nirvana; or an absorption of the finite into the Infinite Essence whose Name cannot be uttered, of Whom no attribute can be predicated, Who is beyond human thought, and of Whom our highest conception is that He is at once ALL and NOTHING. Hence the semi-Pantheism of one branch, the German; the Quietism of another, the French and Italian; the Antinomian Illuminism of a third, the Spanish. The end of perfection is such oneness with God as excludes or suppresses the consciousness of individuality and of a phenomenal universe on the way to Him; and, when that goal is reached, destroys all distinction between Him and His creature for ever. The means are abstraction and contemplation, to the exclusion of most of the processes of the Christian life

VI. The Roman Catholic doctrine, or rather varieties of doctrine, concerning Christian Perfection, combines the results of most of the theories already referred to, and adds some elements common to it and Arminiamsm. Here we refer to the standards of Romanism; but it must be remembered that this most comprehensive of all theological systems includes a Jansenist teaching, which modifies the doctrine in the spirit of St

Augustine and of modern Calvinism. It may be said that in Roman Catholicism there may be found statements of the subject conformed to every one of the theories of our present sketch. But we have to do with the sanctioned dogma alone; first, in its bases of truth, and secondly, in its erroneous superstructure

1. The Council of Trent determined with reference to the perfection of possible obedience, that, negatively, there is no bar to an entire conformity with the law; and, positively, that a complete satisfaction of its requirements is necessary to salvation. " Nemo temeraria ilia voce uti debet, Dei praecepta homini justificato ad observandum esse impossibilia. Licet enim in hac mortali vita quantumvis sancti et justi in Iaevia saltem et quotidiana, quae etiam venialia dicuntur, peccata quandoque cedant, non propterea desinant esse justi." But the necessity of even venial sin is by implication denied: "Si quis in quolibet bono opere justum saltem venialiter peccare dixerit . . . anathema esto." This high doctrine of the satisfaction of the Divine law requires as its foundation

that its demands are relaxed to meet the fallen estate of man: it is the law PRO HUJUS VITAE STATU that believers may and must fulfill. Hence venial sins, sins of mere infirmity or unpremeditated sin into which the will does not enter, are no deduction from the estate of perfection in the righteous estimate of God. But on this subject the Council did not speak at length. Bellarmine expands its doctrine thus: " The defect of charity, for instance, our not performing good works with as much fervor as we shall exhibit in heaven, is indeed a defect, but not a fault, and is not sin. Whence our charity, although imperfect in comparison of the charity of the blessed, yet may absolutely be called perfect." "If the precepts of God were impossible, they would oblige no man, and therefore would not be precepts." So also Mohler, a more modern expositor of Roman Catholic doctrine, says: " Either it is possible for man, strengthened and exalted by Divine aid, to observe the moral law, in its spirit, its true inward essence, or it is impossible to do so. If the former, then such observance cannot be too strongly urged; and everyone may find a proof of its possibility in the fact that, on every transgression, he accuses himself as a sinner: for every accusation of such a kind involves the supposition that its fulfillment is possible, and even, with assistance from above, not difficult. But, if the latter, then the cause must be sought only in God: either He has not framed human nature for the attainment of that moral standard which He proposes, or He does not impart those higher powers which are necessary to the pure and not merely outward compliance with His laws. ... If it be urged that reference is had exclusively to man’s fallen nature, we reply that God in Christ Jesus has raised us from the Fall; and it was justly observed by the Council of Trent that, in virtue of the power of Christ’s Spirit, no precept was impracticable to man. For to the heritage of corruption a heritage of spiritual power in Christ has been opposed, and the latter can in every way be victorious over the former. Or, do we believe that the moral law was framed merely for the nature of Adam, for his brief abode in Paradise, and not for the thousands of years that humanity has to endure?" 2. But there is much error connected with the sound truth and vitiating it. The error is twofold: it undervalues the Scriptural teaching as to the extinction of sin, and it exaggerates the operation of sanctifying love

(1.) There is no provision for the suppression of the principle of sin in the regenerate; without which every doctrine of sanctification must be imperfect. The remains of original sin, or Concupiscence, baptismal grace does not remove; but, all condemnation being removed from the justified, God does not regard the fomes or fuel of sin to be sin itself

Here there are two things to be noted. First, the theory which so strongly protests against the forensic imputation of righteousness nevertheless resorts, though without avowing it, to a reckoning of the Divine estimate which beholds no evil in what is undoubtedly " of the nature of sin." Holding that in the regenerate this remainder of the carnal mind is not accounted for guilt, we insist that it is sin, and pardoned only through habitual faith and in prospect of its entire removal. Secondly, the inconsistency of the doctrine appears in this, that such concupiscence is a root of evil which, though not sin in itself, yet requires to be utterly removed by discipline. If removed in the present life, then the Romanist doctrine is imperfect in not making provision for this. If removed in another state, the error of purgatorial grace is introduced. Once more let Mohler be heard, who makes the best of his cause in the context: " Hence, the question recurs: how shall man be finally delivered from sin, and how shall holiness in him be restored to perfect life? Or, in case we leave this earthly world, still bearing about us some stains of sin, how shall we be purified from them? Shall it be by the mechanical deliverance from the body, whereof the Protestant Formularies

speak so much? But it is not easy to discover how, when the body is laid aside, sin is therefore purged out from the sinful spirit. It is only one who rejects the principle of moral freedom in sin, or who has been seduced by Gnostic or Manichsean errors, that could look with favor on a doctrine of this kind. Or are we to imagine it to be some potent word of the Deity, or some violent mechanical process, whereby purification ensues? Some sudden, magical change the Protestant doctrine unconsciously presupposes; and this phenomenon is not strange, since it teaches that by original sin the mind had been deprived of a certain portion, and that in regeneration man is completely passive. But the Catholic, who cannot regard man other than as a free, independent agent, must also recognize this free agency in his final purification, and repudiate such a mechanical process as inconsistent with the whole moral government of the world. It God were to employ an economy of this nature then Christ came in vain. Therefore is our Church forced to maintain such a doctrine of justification in Christ, and of a moral conduct in this life regulated by it, that the Redeemer will at the day of judgment have fulfilled the claims of the law outwardly for us, but on that very account inwardly in us The consolation, therefore, is to be found in the power of the Redeemer which effaces as well as forgives sin: yet in a twofold way. With some it consummates purification in this life: with others it perfects it only in the life to come. The latter are they who by faith, love, and a sincere penitence, have knit the bond of communion with the Lord, but only in a partial degree, and at the moment of their quitting life were not entirely pervaded by His Spirit: to them will be communicated the saving power, that at the day of judgment they also may be found pure in Christ. Thus the doctrine of a place of purifying is closely connected with the Catholic theory of justification." This is followed by a vigorous exposure of the inconsistencies of the Lutheran Formularies, in much of which we must concur but far greater is the inconsistency of " the mechanical process " that separates sin from the nature after its departure from the body. Surely the original sin, which is the fleshly mind, cannot be the object of sanctifying grace in the pure spirit. It may be replied that it is not the principle of sin, but the stain of it, that purgatorial discipline removes

Then we fall back on the charge, that the Romanist doctrine, strong as against those who insist that death is the destruction of sin, is weak in making no provision for the suppression and extinction of concupiscence

(2.) The love which is the strength of entire consecration in all who believe is made by the Romanist teaching a power that may more than fulfill the law. With what subtlety this erroneous principle glides into the theology of Rome may be seen in the following words of Mohler: " Some men of late have defended the old orthodox Lutheran doctrine by assuring us that the moral law proposes to men an ideal standard, which, like everything ideal, necessarily continues unattained. If such really be the case with the moral law, then He who comes not up to its requirements can as little incur responsibility as an epic poet for not equaling the Iliad." So far well; but here follows the unevangelical notion that love may achieve Works of Supererogation, by keeping the Counsels of Perfection recommended though not imposed by our Lord; and thus adding to the general meritoriousness of all good works the special Merits of an obedience above law. " More rational, at least, is the theory that the higher a believer stands in the scale of morality, the more exalted are the claims of the moral law upon him: so that they increase, as it were, to infinity with the internal growth of man, and leave him ever behind them. Now, when we contemplate the lives of the saints the opposite phenomenon strikes our attention. The consciousness of being in the possession of

an all-sufficing, infinite power, discloses more and more the tenderer and nobler relations of man to God, and to his fellowcreatures; so that the sanctified in Christ, filled with His Spirit, ever feels himself superior to the law. It is the nature of heavenborn love, which stands so infinitely far above the claims of the mere law, never to be content with its own doings, and ever to be more ingenious in its own devices; so that Christians of this stamp not unfrequently seem to others of a lower grade of perfection to be enthusiasts, or men of distempered mind. Only in this way that remarkable doctrine can be satisfactorily explained, —which, like every other that has for ages existed and seriously engaged the human mind, is sure to rest on some sure foundation, —the doctrine, namely, that there can be works which are more than sufficient (OPERA SUPERERO-GATIONIS), the tendency and delicacy of which eluded the perception of the Reformers." If this doctrine meant only that love in the regenerate soul aspires to a perfection which cannot be measured by the standard of any positive precepts, it would be unimpeachable: so stated, it would be only another form of the Lutheran and Calvinistic assertion that the external law is abrogated in Christ, being exchanged for the internal law, by which believers may render obedience in a higher and nobler spirit. All that is noble in the theory of supererogatory works is maintained by all sound Protestants; but they make it consistent with the Evangelical covenant by declaring that no such works can be above the requirements of the law interpreted by love, that even these are accepted as wrought by the believer because their imperfection is constantly forgiven for the sake of the Atonement, and that their absolute merit is utterly excluded by our Lord when He bids such as are supposed to have performed them call themselves unprofitable servants who have done only that which it was their duty to do The attempt to separate between law and love is a hopeless one: love is said to be the fulfilling of the law, and in maintaining that everlasting principle against their opponents the Romanist divines had Scripture on their side; but in establishing it as a higher standard than the moral law which it only interprets, and in linking it with special and arbitrary counsels which are made into statutory laws binding on a particular class, and, above all, in assigning specific merit, the merit of satisfaction, to the acts of this Estate of Perfection, they are contradicted both by the spirit and the letter of the entire New Testament. But this subject carries us onward to Christian Ethics

VI. The theory of Imputation may serve to designate the doctrine of Christian Perfection as taught in the Standards of the Reformation, both Lutheran and Reformed, and especially in modern Calvinism. It assumes that the Christian’s entire sanctification as well as complete justification is provided for the believer, and applied to him, as a free gift of the covenant of grace. The three following texts may be regarded as summing up, in their unity and their order, the essentials of this doctrine. Ye are complete in Him.1 By one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.2 Who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness and sanctification, and redemption.3 These passages are not absolutely misunderstood, but they are very partially applied. Our Lord is not in the same sense our sanctification, with the meaning of moral perfection, as that in which He is OUT righteousness. It has been seen that He is our sanctification without any cooperation of ours, so far as sanctification is the cleansing from guilt. But sin itself cannot be done away by imputation of righteousness or non-imputation of guilt. Hence the Calvinist teaching denies that it is done away; at least, in what is strictly speaking the state of probation: in the present age it is never abolished as a principle and power within, but vanishes by being reckoned to the believer as non-existent, by being hidden under the unsullied robe of the Redeemer’s holiness. The people of Christ are that Israel of whom it is said, He hath seen no iniquity in Jacob.

It insists that the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh to the end, so that ye CANNOT do the things that ye would.4 But these words, soundly interpreted, say no more than that ye MIGHT NOT do the things that ye would. The flesh itself is crucified once for all, with the affections and lusts, not by imputation but by the act of those that are Christ's, who while they wait to see the end of the body of sin, expecting till the sword from on high smite it with the last stroke, also mortify, or put to death, their members which are upon the earth.5 This method of stating the doctrine tends to three issues in three different classes 1 Colossians 2:10; 2 Hebrews 10:14; 3 1 Corinthians 1:30; 4 Galatians 5:17; Galatians 5:24; 5 Colossians 3:5

1. In some it leads to Antinomianism. The pursuit of an independent perfection, such as shall crown the individual's own character, is regarded as a superfluity, not indeed of naughtiness but of goodness. It is thought to be the glory of Christ to defy or negative, in the name of His own, both the condemnation and the demands of the law. For this, however, neither Augustinianism, nor Calvinism is responsible: it is sui generis, a heresy apart, Antinomianism proper; and, as such, is condemned of itself, autokatakritos, the object of reprobation to all true theology, and, in fact, the common enemy

2. But even in orthodox systems which make Christ too absolutely the Substitute of the believer, the thought of a perfection already belonging to His people, and ready to be revealed, must needs in some measure tend to check the ardor of desire for a personal and inwrought holiness, affording subtle encouragement to the thought that any remainders of sin serve only to feed humility and glorify the grace of God. The warnings of Scripture, and the confessions of the saints themselves, give evidence that this witness is true and that this danger is real

3. It is in its noblest representatives a most mighty stimulant to the pursuit of personal perfection. Union with the Lord is the soul of their doctrine, and of their ethics, and of their hopes; and, where the aspiration towards fellowship with Christ has its full unhindered influence on the soul, it excites an unbounded horror of sin and thirst for holiness. It is the more Christian form of that union with God which was the goal of perfection to the more ancient Mystics

VII. The early Arminians wrote much on Christian Perfection: but laid down no very determinate principles on this subject. Their statements, however, contain the germ of the doctrine which Methodism has developed. They were led by their theological convictions to the truth that such holiness as God reputes perfect may be attained in the present life

They dwelt upon a first perfection of the beginning of Christianity; a second perfection of the unimpeded progress of regenerate religion; and a third perfection of an established maturity of grace: a triple distinction which is in harmony with the teachings of the Gospels and Epistles. They did not however speak very positively about the means, the assurance and the limitations of the last stage. Episcopius says: "The commandments of God may be kept with what He regards as a perfect fulfillment, in the supreme love which the Gospel requires according to the covenant of grace, and in the utmost exertion of human strength assisted by Divine help. This consummation includes two things, (1) A perfection proportioned to the powers of each individual;

(2) A pursuit of always higher perfection." Limborch describes it as " perfect, in being correspondent to the provisions and terms of the Divine covenant.

It is not sinless or an absolutely perfect obedience, but such as consists in a sincere love of piety, absolutely excluding every habit of sin. It has three degrees, that of the truly perfect being the entire suppression of every habit of sin." The Remonstrant divines exhibited their doctrine rather in its opposition to Romanist works of supererogation, on the one hand, and Antinoimanism on the other. They did not pursue it into its deep relation to sin, and to love, and to Evangelical perfection. But the following extract from Arminius himself will show their true position in relation to this subject. " Besides those doctrines which I have treated, there is now much discussion respecting the Perfection of Believers in this life; and it is reported that I hold opinions allied to those of the Pelagians, viz., that it is possible for the regenerate perfectly to keep God's precepts. To this I reply that, though these might have been my sentiments, yet I ought not on this account to be considered a Pelagian, either partly or entirely, provided I had only added that they could do this by the grace of Christ, and by no means without it

But, while I never asserted that a believer could perfectly keep the precepts of Christ in this life, I never denied it, but always left it as a matter to be decided. For I have contented myself with those sentiments which St. Augustine has expressed on this point He marks four questions which claim our attention.

(1) Was there ever a man without sin, one who from the beginning of life never committed sin 1 and he decides that such a person never yet lived, nor will hereafter come into existence, with the exception of Jesus Christ.

(2) Has there ever been, is there now, or can there possibly be, an individual who does not sin, that is, who has attained to such a state of perfection in this life as not to commit sin, but perfectly to fulfill the law of God? and he does not think that any man has ever reached this.

(3) Is it possible for a man to exist without sin in this life? and he thinks that this is possible by means of the grace of God and free will.

(4) If it be possible for a man to be without sin, why has such an individual never been found I and he answers, that man does not do what is possible to him by the grace of Christ to perform: either because that which is good escapes his observation, or because in it he places no part of his delight. Besides this, the same Christian Father says, 'Let Pelagius confess that it is possible for a man to be without sin in no other way than by the grace of Christ, and we will be at peace with each other.' The opinion of Pelagius, however, was to Augustine only this, that man could fulfill the law of God by his own proper strength and ability; but with still greater facility by means of the grace of Christ. I have shown abundantly the great distance at which I stand from such a sentiment." But the vital question of the abolition of original sin was never, either by Arminius or his successors, decided upon The following exposition of the general doctrine of Sanctification will put this in a clear light. It is abridged from the Private Disputations of Arminius, which contain the principles of his uncompleted system of theology: "

(1) The word Sanctification denotes an act by which anything is separated from common, and is consecrated to Divine, use

(2) Common use is either according to nature itself, by which man lives a natural life; or according to the assumption of sin, by which he obeys it in its lusts. Divine use is when a man lives unto godliness, in conformity to the holiness and righteousness in which he was created. Therefore this

Sanctification, with respect to the terminum a quo, is either from the natural use or from the use of sin; with respect to the terminum ad quern, it is the supernatural and Divine use.

(3) When we treat of man as a sinner, Sanctification is a gracious act of God by which he purifies man who is a sinner, and yet a believer, from ignorance, from indwelling sin with its lusts and desires, and imbues him with the spirit of knowledge, righteousness, and holiness; that, being separated from the life of the world, and being made conformable to God, he may live the Divine life. It consists in the mortification or death of the old man, and the quickening of the new man. The Author of Sanctification is God the Holy Father Himself, in His Son, who is the Holy of holies, through the Spirit of holiness. The External Instrument is the Word of God; the Internal is faith in the Word preached,

(4) The Object of Sanctification is man, a sinner and yet a believer; a sinner, because his sin has made him unfit to serve the living God; a believer, because he is united to Christ, died to sin and is raised in a new life.

(5) The Subject is properly the soul of man: the mind, first, and then the affections of the will, which is delivered from the dominion of indwelling sin, and filled with the spirit of holiness. The body is not changed; but, as it is a part of the man who is consecrated to God, and removed by the sanctified soul from the purposes of sin, it is employed in the Divine service.

(6) The process lies in purification from sin, and conformity with God in the body of Christ through the Holy Ghost.

(7) As, under the Old Dispensation, the priests, approaching the worship of God, were sprinkled with blood, so the blood of Christ sprinkles us, His priests, to serve the living God. In this respect, the sprinkling of the Redeemer’s blood, which principally serves for the expiation of sin, and is the cause of justification, belongs to sanctification also. For, in justification the sprinkling washes away the guilt of sins that have been committed; but in sanctification it serves to sanctify those who have received remission, that they may be enabled to offer spiritual sacrifices to God through Christ.

(8) This sanctification is not completed in a single moment; but sin, from whose dominion we have been delivered through the cross and death of Christ, is weakened more and more by daily detriments or losses, and the inner man daily renewed more and more, while we carry about with us in our bodies the death of Christ, and the outward man is perishing.

(9) COROLLARY. We permit this question to be made the subject of discussion: Does the death of the body bring the perfection and completion of sanctification; and how is this effect produced?" With this unsatisfactory conclusion does the Remonstrant theology leave the question. It was the hard necessity of its first representatives to maintain the truths committed to them in the face of persecution and obloquy almost unparalleled. Arminius himself transmitted only the lineaments of a system of theology; he was early taken away; but his protest against ultra-Calvinism was taken up by the Pietists of Germany, and in a still purer form by the English Platonists, who in the exposition and enforcement of Christian Perfection paved the way for the Methodism of another century

VIII. The Methodist modification of this Arminian doctrine, and of all other congenial exhibitions of it, may be gathered from the writings of John Wesley, dogmatic and defensive, from the Methodist

Hymn-book, which sings a higher strain on this subject than any other psalmody in Christendom, ancient or modern; and in the commentaries and monographs which treat the question, whether in England or in America. A clear view can be gained only by dividing between the essentials of the doctrine believed by the entire community, and certain non-essential aspects of it which appear different to different eyes

1. The doctrine of Christian Perfection which the Wesleys taught was very early embraced, and in its main elements was consistently maintained throughout their career

It was presented to them at first in its mystical and ascetic form, as an object of ethical aspiration; it never afterwards lost this character; the grandeur and depth of Thomas a Kempis, and the best Mysticism of antiquity, are reflected in the hymns of Charles Wesley, and in all the writings of John Wesley, even the most controversial, on this subject. To this preparatory discipline the Methodist doctrine owes much: the foundations of its future highest teaching were laid before the first elements of it were clearly understood From the very beginning it had this burden committed to it; the clear views of its Founders as to the acceptance of the believer, and his assurance of acceptance, were connected from the very outset with clear views as to his privilege of being filled with the love of God and delivered from indwelling sin, and attaining, as the result, a state of Evangelical perfection. This doctrine was not the slow result of reflection and study of the Scriptures. It was indeed confirmed by these; but it was most assuredly a truth bound up with the Methodist commission from the very first. It was simply the doctrine of former ages with one element, formerly indistinct, cleared up; that, namely, which made the entire sanctification of the believer a provision of the new covenant directly administered by the Holy Spirit to faith: to faith working by love and preparing for it, to faith making this blessing its express object, and to faith as retaining it through constant union with the risen Savior. A few extracts from the last testimonies of John Wesley will establish all these points, and at the same time give a fair epitome of the Methodist doctrine in its relation to the work of the Spirit and the co-operation of man. They are taken from "A Plain Account of Christian Perfection, as believed and taught by the Reverend Mr. John Wesley, from the year 1725 to the year 1777," found in the eleventh volume of his works: a tract which deserves most careful study, not only as a defense of the doctrine, but as containing one of the noblest collections of Spiritual Exercises in the English language. The selections are chosen with reference to the three points mentioned above, but they fairly exhibit the spirit of the whole

(1.) Christian Perfection was taught by early Methodism as the seal of the Holy Ghost set upon the earnest striving of the regenerate will: "This great gift of God, the salvation of our souls, is no other than the image of God fresh stamped on our hearts. It is a 'renewal of believers in the spirit of their minds, after the likeness of Him that created them.'" From this it appears that entire sanctification was regarded as in reality the perfection of the regenerate state, a view confirmed as follows: "The more care should we take to keep the simple Scriptural account continually in our eye. Pure love reigning alone in the heart and life—this is the whole of Scriptural perfection.

Q. When may a person judge himself to have attained this?

A. When, after having been fully convinced of inbred sin, by a far deeper and clearer conviction than that he experienced before justification, and after having experienced a gradual mortification of it, he experiences a total death to sin, and an entire renewal in the love and image of God, so as

to rejoice evermore, to pray without ceasing, and in everything to give thanks. Not that ’ to feel all love and no sin’ is a sufficient proof. Several have experienced this for a time, before their souls were fully renewed. None therefore ought to believe that the work is done, till there is added the testimony of the Spirit witnessing his entire sanctification as clearly as his justification Q. But whence is it that some imagine they are thus sanctified, when in reality they are not?

A. It is Hence; they do not judge by all the preceding marks, but either by part of them or by others that are ambiguous. But I know no instance of a person attending to them all, and yet deceived in this matter. I believe, there can be none in the world. If a man be deeply and fully convinced, after justification, of inbred sin; if he then experience a gradual mortification of sin, and afterwards an entire renewal in the image of God; if to this change, immensely greater than that wrought when he was justified, he added a clear, direct witness of the renewal; I judge it as impossible this man should be deceived herein, as that God should lie. And if one whom I know to be a man of veracity testify these things to me, I ought not, without some sufficient reason, to reject his testimony " Q. Is this death to sin, and renewal in love, gradual or instantaneous? "

A. A man may be dying for some time; yet he does not, properly speaking, die, till the instant the soul is separated from the body; and in that instant he lives the life of eternity In like manner, he may be dying to sin for some time; yet he is not dead to sin, till sin is separated from his soul; and in that instant he lives the full life of love. And as the change undergone, when the body dies, is of a different kind, and infinitely greater than any we had known before, yea, such as till then it is impossible to conceive; so the change wrought, when the soul dies to sin, is of a different kind, and infinitely greater than any before, and than any can conceive till he experiences it. Yet he still grows in grace, in the knowledge of Christ, in the love and image of God; and will do so, not only till death, but to all eternity.

Q. How are we to wait for this change?

A. Not in careless indifference, or indolent inactivity; but in vigorous, universal obedience, in a zealous keeping of all the commandments, in watchfulness and painfulness, in denying ourselves, and taking up our cross daily; as well as in earnest prayer and fasting, and a close attendance on all the ordinances of God. And if any man dream of attaining it any other way, (yea, or of keeping it when it is attained, when he has received it even in the largest measure) he deceiveth his own soul. It is true, we receive it by simple faith: but God does not, will not, give that faith, unless we seek it with all diligence, in the way which He hath ordained."

(2.) This extract has anticipated the second point: that the destruction of "inbred sin/’ which is to the individual what " original sin " is to the race of which he is a member, is to be made the object of faith; and therefore to be followed by assurance; and evidenced in confession. Faith, its assurance and its profession, generally go together in John Wesley’s writings; but the two latter are kept in their distinct and subordinate place With regard to the first, a simple extract will be enough. It refers to the decisions of an early Conference as to certain points of discussion: "

Q. How much is allowed by our brethren who differ from us as to entire sanctification?

A. They grant (1) That everyone must be entirely sanctified in the article of death.

(2) That till then a believer daily grows in grace, comes nearer and nearer to perfection (3) That we ought to be continually pressing after it, and to exhort all others so to do.

Q What do we allow them?

A. We grant,

(1) That many of those who have died in the faith, yea, the greater part of those we have known, were not perfected in love, till a little before their death.

(2) That the term sanctified is continually applied by St. Paul to all who were justified.

(3) That by this term alone, he rarely, if ever, means, ' saved from all sin.'

(4) That, consequently, it is not proper to use it in that sense, without adding the word wholly, entirely, or the like.

(5) That the inspired writers almost continually speak of, or to those who were justified, but Very rarely of, or to those who were wholly sanctified.

(6) That, consequently, it behooves us to speak almost continually of the state of justification: but more rarely, 'at least in full and explicit terms, concerning entire sanctification.' Q. What then is the point where we divide? A. It is this: Should we expect to be saved from all sin before the article of death?

Q. Is there any clear Scriptural promise of this, —that God will save us from all sin?

A. There is: 'He shall redeem Israel from all his sins.'" Then follow a number of passages from both Testaments, containing promises and commandments which declare the believer's privilege, and indirectly make the destruction of inbred sin the object of personal faith. Indirectly: for it is never asserted that a specific promise to this effect is given. At a later time these distinct words occur: "

(1) That Christian perfection is that love of God and our neighbor which implies deliverance from all sin;

(2) that this is received merely by faith;

(3) that it is given instantaneously, in one moment;

(4) that we are to expect it, not at death, but every moment; that now is the accepted, time, now is the day of salvation." But again: " As to the manner. I believe this perfection is always wrought in the soul by a simple act of faith; consequently in an instant. But I believe a gradual work, both preceding and following that instant. As to the time I believe this instant generally is the instant of death, the moment before the soul leaves the body. But I believe it may be ten, twenty, or forty years before. I believe it is usually many years after justification; but that it may be within five years or five months after it, I know no conclusive argument to the contrary

If it must be many years after justification, I would be glad to know how many. Pretium quotus arroget annus?" " But in some this change was not instantaneous. They did not perceive the instant when it was wrought. It is often difficult to perceive the instant when a man dies; yet there is

an instant in which life ceases. And if ever sin ceases, there must be a last moment of its existence, and a first moment of our deliverance from it." As to the assurance following this faith Mr. Wesley's doctrine was once more a general deduction from the principle that in things pertaining to the Christian salvation perfect faith is attended by its interior evidence. The following observations are very suggestive on this subject generally. "

Q. But does not sanctification shine by its own light?

A. And does not the new birth too? Sometimes it does; and so does sanctification; at others it does not. In the hour of temptation Satan clouds the work of God, and injects various doubts and reasonings, especially in those who have either very weak or very strong understandings. At such times there is absolute need of that witness . . ..

Q. But what Scripture makes mention of any such thing, or gives any reason to expect it?

A. That Scripture, ' We have received, not the spirit that is of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we may know the things that are freely given us of God.' (1 Corinthians 11:12.) Now surely sanctification is one of 'the things which are freely given us of God.' . . . Consider likewise 1 John 5:19 : 'We know that we are of God.' How? 'By the Spirit that He hath given us.' Nay, ' hereby we know that He abideth in us.' And what ground have we, either from Scripture or reason, to exclude the witness, any more than the fruit, of the Spirit from being here intended? Not that I affirm that all young men, or even fathers, have this testimony every moment. There may be intermissions of the direct testimony that they are thus born of God; but those intermissions are fewer and shorter as they grow up in Christ; and some have the testimony both of their justification and sanctification without any intermission at all; which I presume more might have, did they walk humbly and closely with God." As to the profession of this experience the general language of Mr. Wesley was guarded: on the one hand, he was anxious to do justice to the New-Testament principle that confession is made unto salvation by all who believe; while, on the other, he was an enemy to enthusiasm, and was deeply impressed with a sense of the self-renunciation and essential humility that belong to the state of perfection. "

Q. How shall we avoid setting perfection too high or too low?

A. By keeping to the Bible, and setting it just as high as the Scripture does. It is nothing higher and nothing lower than this, the pure love of God and man; the loving God with all our heart and soul, and our neighbor as ourselves. It is love governing the heart and life, running through all our tempers, words, and actions.

Q Supposing one had attained to this, would you advise him to speak of it?

A. At first perhaps he would scarce be able to refrain, the fire would be so hot within him: his desire to declare the lovingkindness of the Lord carrying him away like a torrent. But afterwards he might; and then it would be advisable not to speak of it to them that know not God (it is most likely it would only provoke them to contradict and blaspheme), nor to others, without some particular reason, without some good in view. And then he should have especial care to avoid all appearance of boasting; to speak with the deepest humility and reverence, giving all the glory to God.... Men do not light a candle to put it under a bushel; much less does the all-wise God. He does not raise such a monument of His power and love to hide it from mankind." 2. But the spirit of

Mr. Wesley’s teaching on this subject may best be discerned in the wise cautions which he threw around the profession of their experience. A few of these may be quoted, not only as showing his moderation on this point, but also as containing a noble defense of the doctrine itself, and its strict connection with faith working by love The constant necessity of the virtue of the Atonement is strongly insisted on: " The best of men need Christ as their Priest, their Atonement, their Advocate with the Father: not only as the continuance of their every blessing depends on His death and intercession, but on account of their coming short of the law of love. For every man living does so." " Bat even these souls dwell in a shattered body, and are so pressed down thereby, that they cannot exert themselves as they would, by thinking, speaking, and acting precisely right For want of better bodily organs, they must at times think, speak, or act wrong; not indeed through a defect of love, but through a defect of knowledge. And while this is the case, notwithstanding that defect, and its consequences, they fulfill the law of love. Yet as, even in this case, there is not a full conformity to the perfect law, so the most perfect do, on this very account, need the blood of atonement, and may properly for themselves, as well as for their brethren, say, ’ Forgive us our trespasses/" Consequently, the highest state of earthly perfection is a gift that may be withdrawn: " it is admissible, capable of being lost; of which we have numerous instances. But we were not thoroughly convinced of this, till five or six years ago." There is no tolerance of the Antinomian spirit in this doctrine. " We are ’ dead to the law by the body of Christ/ given for us (Romans 7:4): to the Adamic as well as Mosaic law. But it does not follow that we are without any law; for God has established another law in its place, even the law of faith. And we are all under this law to God and to Christ." Love is the fulfilling of every law. " The whole law under which we now are is fulfilled by love. Faith working or animated by love is all that God requires of man. He has substituted (not sincerity, but) love, in the room of angelic perfection." There is no limit to the stern cautions everywhere administered to professors of entire sanctification. " Beware of that daughter of pride, enthusiasm. 0 keep at the utmost distance from it! Give no place to a heated imagination. Do not hastily ascribe things to God. Do not easily suppose dreams, voices, impressions, visions, or revelations to be from God. They may be from Him. They may be from nature. They may be from the devil. Therefore ’ believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God.’ Try all things by the written Word, and let all bow down before it. You are in danger of enthusiasm every hour, if you depart ever so little from Scripture; yea, or from the plain, literal meaning of any text, taken in connection with the context. And so you are if you despise or lightly esteem reason, knowledge, or human learning; every one of which is an excellent gift of God, and may serve the noblest purposes." " One general inlet to enthusiasm is, expecting the end without the means; the expecting knowledge, for instance, without searching the Scriptures, and consulting the children of God; the expecting spiritual strength without constant prayer, and steady watchfulness; the expecting any blessing without hearing the Word of God at every opportunity." But everywhere, in common with the strain of the deepest theology of all ages, love is made the safeguard as it is the strength of perfection. "Another ground of these and a thousand mistakes is the not considering deeply that love is the highest gift of God: humble, gentle, patient love. The heaven of heavens is love. There is nothing higher in religion; there is, in effect, nothing else; if you look for anything but more love, you are looking wide of the mark, you are getting out of the royal way. And when you are asking others, * Have you received this or that blessing?’ if you mean anything but mere love, you mean wrong

Settle it then in your heart, that from the moment God has saved you from all sin, you are to aim at nothing more, but more of that love described in the thirteenth of the Corinthians. You can go no higher than this, till you are carried into Abraham’s bosom." " Fire is the symbol of love; and the love of God is the principle and end of all our good works. But truth surpasses figure; and the fire of Divine love has this advantage over material fire, that it can reascend to its source, and raise thither with it all the good works which it produces. And by this means it prevents their being corrupted by pride, vanity, or any evil mixture. But this cannot be done otherwise than by making these good works in a spiritual manner die in God, by a deep gratitude, which plunges the soul in Him as in an abyss, with all that it is,’ and all the grace and works for which it is indebted to Him: a gratitude whereby the soul seems to empty itself of them, that they may return to their source, as rivers seem willing to empty themselves, when they pour themselves with all their waters into the sea. When we have received any favor from God we ought to retire, if not into our closets, into our hearts, and say: ’I come, Lord, to restore to Thee what Thou hast given; and I freely relinquish it, to enter again into my own nothingness. For what is the most perfect creature in heaven or earth in Thy presence, but a void capable of being filled with Thee and by Thee; as the air which is void and dark is capable of being filled with the light of the sun, who withdraws it every day to restore it the next, there being nothing in the air that either appropriates this light or resists it? 0 give me the same facility of receiving and restoring Thy grace and good works! I say THINE; for I acknowledge the root from which they spring is in Thee, and not in me." 3. Reviewing the whole, we may conclude that, while the substance of the Methodist doctrine of Entire Sanctification is the same which has been aimed at in all the purest types of practical theology, it has some points of difference, or specific characteristics of great importance

(1.) It connects the fulfillment of the Evangelical law with the effusion of Divine love in the heart more strictly and consistently than any other system of teaching. The Mystical and Ascetic teachers of perfection have generally made love, and that the love of God, their keynote. But they seldom gave a good account of the relation of that love to the obedience which is essential to perfection. Some of them erred by making the absolute moral law the standard; and then the highest result was a striving towards a perfection which death only could introduce. Others lost all thought of law in the contemplation of the holiness of Christ, and their perfection was the gradual transformation of the character into His image. Others rightly viewed love as the fulfilling of the law; and supposed that its value in the sight of God was such as to obtain a meritorious acceptance beyond that of mere obedience to any law: forgetting, meanwhile, that the preciousness of love as a grace springs from its faith in the Merit and Strength of the Redeemer. Others separated between the righteousness of the law which is unattainable, and must be reckoned to the believer, and the perfection of love which he may attain in his own person: thus dividing what the Scripture joins But the Methodist doctrine boldly declares that the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in believers, that is the righteousness of the new law of faith; and that as faith is reckoned for righteousness, so faith working by love is reckoned for perfection

(2.) The Methodist doctrine is the only one that has consistently and boldly maintained the possibility of the destruction of the carnal mind, or the inbred sin of our fallen nature

It is true that certain of the Mystics held, as we have seen, something almost equivalent to this doctrine; and that the Pietists of the school of Spener included the annihilation of the old Adam among the privileges of God’s children. But the utmost contemplated by them was the gradual

suppression of the evil nature through the ascendancy of love. Now it is undeniable that a very large portion of the Methodist teaching takes that ground. On the same principle that the shedding abroad of love is made the spring of regeneration, its perfect effusion is made the strength of entire sanctification. In many passages of Sermons and Hymns the Wesleys expressly taught this. But they failed not to look deeper into the heart than the region of its affections. They knew that life is more even than love; and that, as the regeneration of the Spirit is the gift of a new life capable of loving God, so the perfection of that love towards God is possible only where the original death of the soul is altogether changed into life. Hence the fervor with which the Hymns appeal to the Holy Ghost for the destruction of inbred sin, and the almost equal earnestness with which the Sermons urge on believers the prayer for faith in the omnipotent power of God, not only to shed abroad His perfect love, but to finish the death of the body of sin. The combination of the two elements, the negative annihilation of the principle of sin and the positive effusion of perfect love, is, it may be said, peculiar to Methodist theology as such

(3.) The original teaching of Methodism was peculiar also in its remarkable blending of the Divine and human elements in the process of entire sanctification. It invariably did justice both to the supreme Divine efficiency and to the co-operation of man. The charge brought against it, sometimes malevolently, sometimes thoughtlessly, that it stimulates believers to expect this supreme and most sacred blessing at any time, irrespective of their preparatory discipline, is contradicted by the whole tenor of the authoritative standards of this doctrine. Wesley’s Sermon on " The Scripture Way of Salvation " contains an elaborate discussion of this point; and it must be taken as a whole by those who would understand the subject. The sum of all is in the following sentences: " Experience shows that, together with this conviction of sin remaining in our hearts, and cleaving to all our works and actions, as well as the guilt which on account thereof we should incur were we not continually sprinkled with the atoning blood, one thing more is implied in this repentance, namely, a conviction of our helplessness.”..." But what good works are those the practice of which you affirm to be necessary to sanctification? First, all works of piety: such as public prayer, family prayer, and praying in our closet; receiving the Supper of the Lord; searching the Scriptures, by hearing, reading, meditating; and using such a measure of fasting or abstinence as our bodily health allows

Secondly, all works of mercy . . .. This is the repentance, and these the ’fruits meet for repentance/ which are necessary to full sanctification. This is the way whereon God hath appointed His children to wait for complete salvation." " Yet they are not necessary either in the same sense with faith, or in the same degree. This repentance and these fruits are only remotely necessary, necessary in order to the continuance of his faith, as well as the increase of it, whereas faith is immediately and directly necessary to sanctification." " To this confidence, that God is both able and willing to sanctify us now, there needs to be added one thing more, —a Divine evidence and conviction that He doeth it. In that hour it is done; God says to the inmost soul, ’According to thy faith be it unto thee!’ then the soul is pure from every spot of sin; it is clean ’ from all unrighteousness.’ The believer then experiences the deep meaning of these solemn words: ’If we walk in the light as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin.’" The intense, absorbing, patient, human preparations of the heart in man are from the same Spirit who at length gives the Divine evidence of the unspeakable power of God to save from all sin. Here it is to be observed that Mr. Wesley passes

from the perfect shedding abroad of love in the heart to the application of the supreme efficacy of the Atonement to take away the evil of the nature: it is " the moment wherein sin ceases to be." It is more, therefore, than the spirit of entire consecration to which many of those who have received his teaching limit it; it is more even than the abundant effusion of love which may fill the heart's sensibilities without purifying its hidden depths: a distinction which his own words refer to: " How clearly does this express the being perfected in love! How strongly imply the being saved from all sin!"

(4.) Finally, the doctrine which runs through the works and the whole career of the Wesleys is marked by its reasonableness and moderation as well as its sublimity. The far greater part of the definitions of it are taken up with defining what it is not. It is not absolute perfection, nor the perfection of angels, nor even that of unfallen Adam: it is a perfection which has come up from much tribulation, and bears the scars of infirmity to the end. It is not immunity from temptation, and the possibility of falling, and the remainders of ignorance and shortcoming in the presence of the perfect law the rigor of which is not applied to it in Christ. It is a perfection which is no other than a perfect selfannihilating life in Christ: a perfect union with His passion and His resurrection, and the perfect enjoyment of the value of His name of Jesus, as it is salvation from sin. It is the perfection of being nothing in self, and all in Him. It is a perfection for which the elect with one consent have longed, from the Apostles downwards: neither more nor less than the unuttered groaning desire of the children of God in every age; the common deep aspiration, with only one note more emphatic than has been always heard, though even that has not been always wanting, the destruction of the inbred sin of our nature. He who searcheth the-heart hath always known the mind of the Spirit, even when its deepest desire has not been clearly uttered. And He will yet, we dare to believe, remove the last fetter from the aspirations of His saints, and give them one heart and one voice in seeking the destruction of the body of sin as well as the mortification of its members

33. Vol 03 - Tenure of Covenant Blessings

Tenure of Covenant Blessings TENURE OF COVENANT BLESSINGS

PROBATION Scriptural Doctrine;

Historical Review;

Test of Religious Systems

ASSURANCE

Objective:

Resurrection of Christ;

Means of Grace. Subjective: The Spirit;

Plerophoria of Faith and Hope and Understanding;

Parrhesia;

Witness of the Spirit HISTORICAL REVIEW

Sacramental:

Mystical:

Calvinism:

Methodism

PERSEVERANCE Grace and its Ground;

Manifestation:

Conditionality

CONTROVERSIAL Covenant of Redemption;

Argument from Scripture THE TENURE OF COVENANT BLESSINGS The Holy Spirit, the Administrator of Redemption, confers its blessings absolutely as the free gift of God in Christ, but not unconditionally and irreversibly. There is no fixed decree which has guaranteed all the concurrences of Providence, all the operations of grace, and all the gifts that assure an abundant entrance into heaven. The Christian covenant places man in a new and gracious PROBATION, gives ample ground of personal ASSURANCE, which as the assurance both of faith and of hope encourages to PERSEVERANCE. The present subject, therefore, requires a consideration of those three terms in their mutual relations

There is a doctrine of Final Perseverance, which as such is only a conventional term used to signify one aspect of the covenant of grace: the irreversible bestowment of its blessings on those for whom Christ died, and for whom it is supposed He cannot have died in vain

According to the view of truth already given, perseverance is an ethical duty, and not a specific gift of the covenant. So far as provision is made for it in that covenant, it belongs to the doctrine of Assurance, which in some form occupies a large and important place in the New Testament. Omitting the term Final, which is the symbol of a peculiar dogma, Perseverance may be made an independent section, for the sake of its own importance, as also to give opportunity of controverting error on the subject, or of setting the truth underlying that error in its right point of view. Thus we have three watchwords which are so correlated that they cannot well be disjoined. Perseverance is only the constant preservation of the Assurance of faith which is the conditional assurance given to a soul in Probation. The believer in Christ begins a new life in a new probation; goes on his way with an habitual assurance; and thus is animated to persevere to the end. This is the New- Testament economy of the Christian life, to which it is everywhere faithful

PROBATION

Probation is the moral trial of a free spirit, continuing for a season under conditions appointed by God, and issuing in the confirmation of an abiding and unchangeable state The Christian scheme, as administered by the Holy Ghost, has not abolished probation, but has invested it with a new and peculiar character of grace, which, however, leaves it probation still

I. Probation has not ceased in the economy of Redemption. The Scripture which says, Ye are not under [the] law but under grace,1 does not mean that we are exempted from test and predestinated to life. It is true that when Adam fell his first estate of trial ended for himself and the race in him; and, according to the analogy of the doom of evil spirits, his destiny and the destiny of manhood was then settled. But the Divine condition of human probation included the prospect of a new and different test applied to the posterity of Adam individually under very different conditions. Man’s independent probation ceased for ever; and began again through a Mediator. Probation did not cease, but its conditions changed. Redemption has not interfered with the law of probationary decision which so far as we know governs the destiny of every created intelligence. Generally, every covenant of God with man implies probation; and in a certain sense all probation involves the idea of covenant. Though diatheke is not precisely sontheke—it is rather Disposition or Arrangement than Covenant proper—it is commandment with promise and condition And these are the essentials of probation. Strictly speaking, covenant only began with the Fall: being the arrangement for salvation through a Mediator. The peculiar kind of covenant of which Scripture speaks is always propounded, ratified, and administered through the mediatorial sacrifice

1 Romans 6:14 II. Probation runs through the new covenant as individual

1. Generally, the entire economy of this dispensation of grace, in all the stages of its development on earth, is filled with the ideas and terms of test. The short history of Paradise is entirely governed by this principle. The Covenant of Grace— before the Law, under the Law, in the Gospel, these three being one—is not less subject to this rule. On God’s part we have a long series of expressions, used to exhibit His relations to men, which are inconsistent with anything but a purpose to discipline and test character, to refuse the evil and choose the good: for instance,

all such words as covenanting, testing, or temptation, striving, trial, discipline, forbearance, hardening or melting the heart, judgment, present and future, rewarding and punishing, reprobation, day of grace; which imply the Divine appointment or institute of probation, and are utterly incomprehensible on any other theory or principle of the destiny of mankind. Similarly, on man's part, we have a long series of counterpart expressions: submission, rebellion, choosing good or evil, tempting God, yielding to or vexing or grieving or quenching His Spirit, conscience, and self-judgment; all these being inexplicable on any other principle than that of a certain control over his own destiny

2. This may, particularly, be viewed with reference to the three main elements of individual probation: its beginning, and its processes, and its end

(1.) The doctrine of Vocation has shown that the beginning of the Gospel in any heart is a test of the moral nature, as the Fall has left it, and of the preliminary and universal influences of the Spirit. Everyone that is of the truth heareth My voice:1 this must refer to the very commencement of a probation: the first word of God to the soul is a test, the very first thought of Christ is a revelation of the hidden fibers of the being. Compel them to come in!2 means simply the vehement appeal that through the mind and heart persuades the will; and the final mystery of acceptance or rejection, notwithstanding all the power of Divine grace, is to be found in a moral attitude of that will. The Cross attracts: I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me:3 helkusoo. No man can come to Me, except the Father which hath sent Me draw him:4 helkusee. The former is the general and the latter is the individual attraction; but both alike detect the character and confirm it. The result is always referred to as the sustaining or failing under a test The preaching of the Gospel is a savor of life unto life, and of death unto death.5 God's co-workers beseech us to receive not the grace of God in vain.6 The Cross is a new testing tree of knowledge of good and evil: man, under the new probation, however, is commanded not to abstain but to take. The probation is now outside of Paradise, but in many of its characteristics it is precisely the same as within. It is bound up with all the issues of Christ's coming. And Jesus said, For judgment I am come into this world:7 this answers at the close to those words of the beginning, This Child is set for the fall and rising again of many... that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed.8 Either through direct preaching or through indirect, in this world or beyond it, certainly before the Judgment Day, the name of Jesus will be, it must be, the touchstone of every man's will and the arbiter of his doom

1 John 18:37; 2 Luke 14:23; 3 John 12:32; 4 John 6:44; 5 2 Corinthians 2:16; 6 2 Corinthians 6:1; 7 John 9:39; 8 Luke 2:34-35

(2.) The processes of the Christian life are all probationary. The Scriptures never address Christians as saved prospectively, only as saved retrospectively : as soozomenous, such as should be saved,1 or who are in process of salvation. The manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal:2 this does not refer only to special endowments; including these, it becomes a universal principle. The whole design of grace is disciplinary. The grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men hath appeared, teaching us;3 paideuousa, it puts us under training and discipline. It is to enable us to make our calling and election sure;4 that in its strength we may be able to withstand in the evil day, and, having done all, to stand.5 On the one hand the injunction is prove your own selves:6 this is one of the few texts in which the very term probation is used; and it signifies that we have to test, and try, and find out the secrets of our own hearts, watching

ourselves under the eye of God as God watched Adam in Paradise. Another is, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.7 Reprobation is never mentioned save in regard to the Christian's failure under test: know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates,8 adokimoi. The word is unknown in the Bible save as the result of man's own act: the only reprobation is the being tried and found wanting. There is no worse self-deception than to regard personal religion as the working out of an absolute and final decree, and to it we may apply St Paul's words: Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.9 The probation is not only decisive as to the degree of our salvation, but decisive of our salvation itself. The test is not simply to ascertain how many cities we may rule over; but whether we shall be trusted at all or rejected

1 Acts 2:47; 2 1 Corinthians 12:7; 3 Titus 2:11-12; 4 2 Peter 1:10; 5 Ephesians 6:13; 6 2 Corinthians 13:5; 7 Romans 12:2; 8 2 Corinthians 13:5; 9 Galatians 6:7

(3.) At the end of all it is not said that the Judge will separate them one from another only, but that it will be as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats:1 the context shows that these words describe their several characters as the result of the probation of a life. And this declaration winds up a series of parables all of which make the eternal issues depend on watchfulness and fidelity: Well done, thou good and faithful servant.2 The final judgment is the revelation of the result of a probationary course. There is a book of life which is the record of the called and chosen3 AND FAITHFUL: this last is now at length added to complete the former. The Lord had again and again referred to the many called and few chosen; and He also indirectly spoke of the still fewer who would endure to the end. But now He combines them all. This is the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.4 But the names were not indelibly written in it from the foundation of the world: had the individual names been written there, in any other sense than as foreseen to be there, it would not have been declared that the preservation of it is the reward of fidelity: to him that overcometh, the promise is, I will not blot out his name out of the look of life.5 1 Matthew 25:32; 2 Matthew 25:21; 3 Revelation 17:14; 4 Revelation 13:8; 5 Revelation 3:5

III. Christian Probation has a specific character of grace. It ought not to be taught as a hard and rigorous doctrine, calmly leaving man to the decision of his own destiny. It is possible that, in recoiling from the former extreme which denies probation altogether, we fall into another which leaves too much in man's destiny to his own caprice. The ceasing of the first probation has introduced another presided over by grace; extending over mankind, in all their states and varieties

1. As it regards the world all men are and ever have been under a probationary constitution of mercy. The kindness and love of God our Savior toward MAN appeared finally in the Gospel; but the same PHILANTHROPY has governed the world from the beginning. The new trial of the race as such is a profound mystery, but a mystery of mercy. Grace, like the Gospel which is its proclamation, was in the world before Christ came; and the nations of men will be dealt with by the righteousness of Him of Whom it was said in the beginning of history, Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?1 The probation of the world at large may be regarded under two aspects. (1.) Nationally, bodies and communities of men are dealt with by the Supreme Governor; they will be judged with strict regard to every advantage which they have enjoyed, and every disadvantage under which they have labored. The laws by which God governs families, communities, nations,

and more or less the race at large, are laws which issue from the Mediatorial Court, are administered by the Redeemer of all men. But with this we have not now to do: it has been and will be discussed in other departments. (2.) The probation of all men individually is one of grace. We can hardly tell how to reconcile this with some of the sayings of Scripture; but the duty of theology is to reconcile those sayings with this truth. The probationary discipline of vast multitudes of the human race in the present life, the hidden processes of their trial, and the apportionment of their doom hereafter, are among the reserved mysteries of faith. Not an individual of all the countless hosts of the descendants of Adam will be dealt with save on the basis of a trial that was appointed for himself as if he were the only individual in probation

1 Genesis 18:25

2. As it regards those who receive revealed truth Evangelical mercy yet more obviously directs probation. All things are ordered to enlist the free will on the side of God. The condemnation of original sin is removed; and its bias to evil is controlled by strong influences of grace. The power of the Holy Spirit is greater than that of evil can be. The force of Divine truth, applied by His Divine energy, and confirmed by the demonstration of Providence, is an element the strength of which must be estimated very highly in the consideration of the trial ordained for those who hear the Gospel. And as to those who hear it amidst the utmost disadvantages for its reception, we must fall back upon the mysterious internal influence which is present to every man behind and in concurrence with the earliest movements of evil 3. In the case of the regenerate probation is peculiarly rich in the provisions of grace.

(1.) Every Christian is the object of personal care and most tender solicitude to the Holy Ghost. A comparison is sometimes made between the probation of Paradise and that of the believer in a fallen world: such a comparison can hardly be instituted to any good purpose. Whatever disabilities sin has entailed on us are more than made up by an indwelling Spirit, the Spirit of a new and higher life. Where sin abounded grace did much more abound.1

(2.) And all events are so ordered that the difficulties of religious experience tend to invigorate the spirit. As blessings temperately enjoyed increase love, so afflictions endured with resignation strengthen the inner man. Through the secret control of the Holy Ghost, not an event in life but contributes to test the character; and under His rule every test sustained leaves that character the stronger. Hence we are bidden to count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations.2 The highest graces of religion, those which the passion of Jesus has invested with a supreme dignity, are the issue of stern probation encountered with patience 1 Romans 5:20; 2 James 1:2

4. But, after all, the Christian covenant leaves men to a probation that is exceedingly solemn. Everyone is taught by the Scripture to regard himself as deciding his lot for eternity. There is very much against him, very much for him; two worlds, of good and evil, enter into his being and contend for his soul. Under other conditions, and with differences that almost forbid the analogy, we all are undergoing the ordeal of the Garden again. The ordinary speech of mankind is true to this most affecting and impressive principle, that the present world is the scene of our trial for the eternal future. We are still in the garden of test; but the object of the discipline of life is to win back the Paradise lost through the grace of Him whose justice cast us out. Youth is a season of probation. In another sense every critical period of life is such: especially the evil day of affliction. But time, every man’s portion of it, is his probationary term. Whatever a man soweth that shall he

also reap!1 is the warning exhortation. That ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and, having done all, to stand:2 this is the encouragement. The result closes the Bible: he that is unjust, let him be unjust still I and he that is holy, let him be holy still!3 Though these words do not directly refer to the eternal state 1 Galatians 6:7; 2 Ephesians 6:13; 3 Revelation 22:11

HISTORICAL This doctrine of probation and test is itself the test of ecclesiastical systems. The history of dogma on this subject, in its wider bearing on the Divine Decrees, has already been briefly given. It is needful now only to make a few more specific allusions to some more prominent relations

I. All systems of Fatalistic Predestinarianism are condemned by the true doctrine of human probation: whether the ancient Fatalism which renounced the idea of one supreme personal God, bringing its Pantheon under the sway of Destiny as the final authority; or the modern Pantheistic Fatalism which makes all things the necessary manifestation— material or spiritual—of one substance, God or nature. If the Deity is for ever evolving Himself in humanity, there can be no probation. The good and evil— good OR evil is interdicted language — are alike God: choice, decision, probation are excluded. The tranquil confidence of many Pantheists in ancient and modern times is pure resignation to the inevitable. The triumph of Christianity is that it gives a still more perfect resignation to one who at the same time knows that every passing hour is pregnant with his eternal interest

II. The dogma of Absolute Sovereignty in God and His government, and the decree of election flowing from it, are to a great extent inconsistent with just ideas of the probation of collective mankind, or of individual man. This may be looked at from several points of view

1. The dogma of an eternal and fixed predestination to salvation and perdition cannot be made to combine with moral trial Probation may indeed be reduced to mean the mere exhibition of the fact and the means of declaring the decree; it may also be made serviceable as tending to decide the varieties of Christian character and the degrees of final reward. But the Christian idea of a moral test is lost; for all its processes are supposed to be already predetermined

2. The more modern Federal Theology which has been grafted on Calvinism shows this still more strikingly. According to this scheme the history of Redemption is distributed under three covenants: first, the Covenant of Redemption between the Father and the Son; secondly, the Covenant of Works made with Adam, including his posterity; and, thirdly, the Covenant of Grace, this being subdivided again into the covenant before the Law, under the Law, and under the Gospel

(1.) With regard to the first, it almost seems to place Christ Himself under a special and peculiar probation: if not in words yet in reality. On behalf of a certain portion of the race the Son of God is supposed to have undertaken the obligation of passive and active obedience: on the condition of His fidelity, this portion of the race is assigned to Him

They are secure, at the expense of an infinite cost to their Surety. His is the stern probation, and not theirs. Though this theology would admit that He could not fail nor be discouraged, and cannot be charged with making Christ’s undertaking doubtful; yet this is a noble inconsistency on its part. In fact, with respect neither to the Surety nor to the assured, is the strict idea of probation retained. But of such a covenant with the Holy Trinity for the partition of mankind the Scripture says nothing

(2.) As to the second there is no such covenant of works in the record. If it is regarded as coming after that first eternal covenant it thereby loses its character as a covenant: the race of Adam is dealt with as necessarily fallen, and sin is made dangerously to rival the Atonement itself, predestined before the foundation of the world. If, on the Sublapsarian theory, the Covenant of Redemption is supposed to be based upon the Fall as a fact, then that covenant still absorbs and destroys the probation of men. The race of Adam failed in one test, and then was under trial no more. The covenant of works remains indeed as a continual remembrance of the Fall; but its only use is to detect and condemn sin and drive men to the better Covenant of Grace ordered in all things and sure

(3.) As to this third, it cannot retain the essential elements of a covenant, supposing personal probation with its contingent issues to be excluded. It may be asserted that the compact of probation ceased when it really began in Christ. To say that God took the elect out of their own hands, and saved them through a Substitute who left nothing to their own will and effort and fidelity, or to contingency, is to contradict the tenor of Scripture, however much it may seem to honor the Divine sovereignty

3. The dogma of the express and distinct imputation of Christ's active righteousness secures the final presentation of the believer before God without spot and blameless; hence there is no deciding test as to his ultimate state. The growth of a new character under the Redeemer's perfect robe has nothing strictly probationary in it: the Christian will not appear in the garment woven of his own righteousness save for the regulation of his reward, and even that is inconsistent with the essential principle that Christ virtually takes the place of the saint and the saint appears as Christ in the entire administration of substitutionary grace

4. The exaggeration of the Divine sovereignty gives this dogma the character of Fatality which we have not hesitated to ascribe to it: it is no other than a Christianised Pantheistic Fatalism. Not unknown Fate or Destiny or moira, but the God and Father of all absolutely disposes, of the souls of men. Probation is, like all things else pertaining to their Christian estate, only imputed to them. Trial, test, and judgment and doom, are mere fiatus vocis, the veils and economical disguises of a dispensation of fixed and necessitated grace III. There are theories of Universalism which deal with this subject, and must be tested by our principle

1. That of a certain final Universal Destruction of Evil teaches that there is room enough in the universe, and time enough in the bosom of eternity, and resources enough in Divine omnipotence, for the gradual and sure annihilation or elimination of all defect, infirmity, and sin from the sum of things. This unlimited dogma maintains the idea of test in its own way: all who fail to sustain the test in this life, and in the succeeding aeons, will be finally destroyed. This is Probation without one of the alternatives of confirmation, which are necessary to its definition, the fixed continuance in evil; and with a new element added, the determination of sovereign Omnipotence. It holds the Calvinistic Sovereignty with a peculiar modification of its own. Whereas Predestinarian Election has for its dark side the foreordained reprobation of the evil as doomed to a fixed estate of eternal ruin, this notion avails itself of an eternal decree for the riddance of the universe from evil. It will plead that the idea of test includes only the detection of evil and no more; but this is neither the philosophical nor the Scriptural meaning of the word

2. The theory of Universal Restoration does the same, but for a different issue. It has the dogma of fixed Predestination, without the Election of Calvinism. It makes the tremendous history of human sin only an interlude that will be forgotten, or only drawn out of the recesses of oblivion as a precedent in the government of other worlds

According to such an idea of probation the Creator indeed experiments with the principle of test and fails; finally withdrawing His creatures from this law with its responsibility, and constraining them to sanctity. Hence this scheme pleads like the former that test aims at the detection of evil alone, but only to bring out the unfathomable resources of Divine grace. In some exhibitions of this principle, the test indeed runs on after this life on principles independent of the redemption of Christ. But in them also, as in all these forms of Universalism, the strict notion of test leading to fixed confirmation is lost

IV. The Hierarchical and Sacramentarian theories of the administration of grace, with their dogma of Merit, in their extreme forms seriously affect this doctrine

1. The principle of a necessary conveyance of grace through Sacraments in the hand of a human mediator tends to undermine the sanctity of human probation: if not in theory certainly in practice. It may be said that the failure of that grace in the case of persons interposing the bar of mortal sin leaves the issues to the applicant: this may indeed save the system from its worst theoretical consequences, but practically it impairs the sense of personal probation, making the Church with its sevenfold hedge of Sacramental ordinances the same kind of refuge from the strain of personal responsibility which Antinomianism makes the merit of Christ. Here, as often, two opposite schools meet

2. The specific dogma that the Counsels of Perfection test the character of believers, and stimulate them to a higher attainment, is an unscriptural one, so far as it introduces a new element in probation. It will be urged that our Lord Himself applied these as tests during His personal administration of His kingdom. But it must be remembered that He used these tests under special circumstances; that, strictly speaking, He never applied but one of the Counsels, that of the renunciation of property; and that, in the application of this, He only laid down a principle of universal importance with a specific reference to the need of a particular case. He never used tests of probation which should distinguish one class of His disciples from another in all ages

3. Hence the doctrine and practice of Romanism as the chief representative of the Sacramentarian system, and that of Merit resulting from obedience to Counsels, in two ways interfere with the reality of probation: first, by taking away to some extent the probationary responsibility of the believer, and, secondly, by applying a superfluous and limited test. Probation is in Christianity the same for all, and for all alike. It is not meant that these systems absolutely undermine the foundations of human trial. They retain the broad features of it, with its eternal issues; but they deeply prejudice its true Evangelical character

V. The general principles of the doctrine here laid down will be found in the Analogy of Bishop Butler, whose chapters on the State of Trial, the Moral Government of God, and the State of Probation, should be carefully studied. A few extracts of a defensive character may appropriately close these remarks

"The general doctrine of Religion, that our present life is a state of probation for a future one, comprehends under it several particular things, distinct from each other. But the first and most common meaning of it seems to be that our future interest is now depending, and depending upon ourselves; that we have scope and opportunity here for that good and bad behavior which God will reward and punish hereafter; together with temptations to one, as well as inducements of reason to the other. And this is, in a great measure, the same with saying that we are under the moral government of God, and to give an account of our actions to Him. For, the notion of a future account and general righteous judgment implies some sort of temptations to what is wrong: otherwise there would be no moral possibility of doing wrong, nor ground for judgment or discrimination. But there is this difference, that the word probation is more distinctly and particularly expressive of allurements to wrong, or difficulties in adhering uniformly to what is right, and of the dangers of miscarrying by such temptations, than the words moral government

"But the thing here insisted upon is, that the state of trial, which Religion teaches us we are in, is rendered credible, by its being throughout uniform and of a piece with the general conduct of Providence towards us, in all other respects within the compass of our knowledge. Indeed if mankind, considered in their capacity as inhabitants of the world only, found themselves, from their birth to their death, in a settled state of security and happiness, without any solicitude or thought of their own: or if they were in no danger of being brought into inconveniences and distress, by carelessness, or the folly of passion, through bad example, the treachery of others, or the deceitful appearances of things: were this our natural condition, then it might seem strange, and be some presumption against the truth of Religion, that it represents our future and more general interest, as not secure of course, but as depending upon our behavior, and requiring recollection and self-government to obtain it. For it might be alleged, 'What you say is our condition in one respect, is not in any wise of a sort with what we find, by experience, our condition is in another. Our whole present interest is secured to our hands, without any solicitude of ours; and why should not our future interest, if we have any such, be so too?' But since, on the contrary, thought and consideration, the voluntary denying ourselves many things which we desire, and a course of behavior far from being always agreeable to us, are absolutely necessary to our acting even a common decent, and a common prudent part, so as to pass with any satisfaction through the present world, and be received upon any tolerable good terms in it: since this is the case, all presumption against self-denial and attention being necessary to secure our highest interest, is removed. Had we not experience it might, perhaps speciously, be urged, that it is improbable anything of hazard and danger should be put upon us by an Infinite Being when everything which is hazard and danger in our manner of conception, and will end in error, confusion, and misery, is now already certain in His foreknowledge." ASSURANCE The full confidence of salvation, which the Divine Spirit works in the believer, is best studied under two aspects. First, there is objective and external ground of assurance provided in the work of redemption and the means of grace. Secondly, there is the individual assurance of faith and of hope and of understanding based upon or flowing from the former through the operation of the Holy Ghost. Having considered these, we must then review the several points in which Christian Confessions vary on these important questions As to the internal assurance, much has already been said in relation to the Spirit's evidence of the several blessings in the Christian covenant; and as to the external something will be added under the doctrine of the Sacraments. But a general view of the ground and nature of assurance is necessary here, as belonging to the theology of Probation OBJECTIVE

ASSURANCE The external and everlasting ground of certainty to the Christian Church that the covenant of grace is sure is the resurrection of its Surety, which is declared historically and confirmed by the Holy Ghost. This confirmation, however, is connected with certain appointed means of grace, which are standing pledges of the Divine fidelity

I. The resurrection of our Lord is set forth throughout the New Testament as the abiding ground of Christian confidence: especially by St. Paul, who knew the Redeemer only as risen. In his First Epistle to the Corinthians, he writes: If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain.1 Preaching in Antioch his first recorded sermon, he marks very emphatically the pledge given in Christ's resurrection. The Father receives the Son: Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee!2 begotten perfectly in human nature as the finished Mediator, Priest, and Prophet, and King. Turning to us He says: I will give you the sure mercies of David, as the pledge of the accomplishment of all the promise which was made unto the fathers. To those who doubt the resurrection of Christ there is not only no assurance as to the truth of Christianity, but there is no assurance of any revelation from God; and from this there is but a step to universal skepticism. This has been exhibited under the Mediatorial Work. It is needful only to sum up:

1 1 Corinthians 15:14; 2 Acts 13:32-34

1. In the resurrection of Christ, the body of believers are certified that sin is abolished as a condemnation and a power, By one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified:1 perfected their ground of assurance, whence their boldness to enter into the holiest. St. Paul says, on behalf of the whole company of saints: I am crucified with Christ!2 His certitude is the certitude of all who are united with the Redeemer, that His life, following on His death of expiation, declares the eternal abolition of the penalty and strength of the law 1 Hebrews 10:14; Hebrews 10:19; 2 Galatians 2:20

2. His resurrection is the pledge of the presence of a living omnipotent Savior in heaven: He is Lord of all,1 said St. Peter in his grand parenthesis: that Jesus, namely, "Whom God raised up the third day and showed Him openly. As the Living Lord who died He Himself gives assurance in His last and most glorious manifestation on earth: Fear not; I am the First and the Last; I am He that liveth and was dead; and behold I am alive for evermore, [Amen]; and have the keys of death and of Hades.2 The interpolated AMEN is common to Christ and the Church: the mutual seal of a full assurance. This is the living pledge or Sacrament in heaven. Him the heavens must receive until the times of restoration of all things:3 the rendering given by Lutheran theology, Who must receive the heavens—that is, for us—is sound theology but unsound interpretation. Christ is, however, in heaven, and the true Tree of life which is in [the midst of] the paradise of God.4 Of this assurance the Church might say: IT IS ENOUGH; let this be instead of all other pledges and Sacraments 1 Acts 10:36; Acts 10:40; 2 Revelation 1:17-18; 3 Acts 3:21; 4 Revelation 2:7

II. But in the purpose of God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of His counsel,1 it is not enough. What the presence of Christ in heaven is as an undying pledge the means of grace are on earth

1 Hebrews 6:17

1. Generally, all means of grace are also seals of grace: the Word or Bible, Prayer, the House of God, the Assembly, the Christian Sabbath, are all standing ordinances which guarantee the

certitude, of salvation. The entire institute of external Christianity is an attestation of Divine fidelity to the covenant of grace; an abiding memorial of the risen Lord

2. Specifically, the Sacraments are silent pledges and seals as well as instruments of grace: such is Baptism at the threshold and such is the Eucharist within; both are seals of the grace of justification, regeneration, and sanctification. Baptism for ever pledges the first and the constant washing away of sin. The Eucharist pledges the first and the constant partaking of Christ: the latter is, in this view, the continuation of the former; and they unite to assure the certitude of the common salvation

3. These are all external or objective pledges for assurance. The very existence of an institute of worship, the everflowing water of baptism, and the table always spread, are silent tokens that salvation is with us: we see heaven open and the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son ofMan 1:1 These ordinances are midway between us and the living eternal Sacrament in heaven: they are sealing ordinances in the Church

We approach them as outward and visible pledges, VERBA VISIBILIA, which cry on earth as the resurrection of Christ does in heaven: Be it known unto you, that through this Man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins.2 But the external becomes the internal pledge: the seal without becomes the seal within 1 John 1:51; 2 Acts 13:38 SUBJECTIVE ASSURANCE The blessing of personal assurance is the gift of the Holy Ghost, whose office is to bear His witness TO the conscience of justification, of adoption WITH the spirit, and IN the soul of sanctification. The assurance is the assurance of faith for the present, of hope for the future, and of understanding as underlying all. As this internal assurance is not independent of the external seals and pledges, so it is itself verified by the testimony of the fruits of faith in the life. The testimony of the Spirit is one, though not one and the same, with the testimony of conscience THE WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT The Holy Spirit discharges, as has been seen, two classes of office on behalf of the Redeemer. He testifies TO the soul the virtue of the things of Christ, and He effects WITHIN the soul the formation of Christ Himself. There is a sense in which both are equally within the human spirit; but we now consider His witness as, so to speak, external

1. He is not expressly said to assure of pardon. That is rather implied and involved than stated. The Savior declared personal forgiveness in His own name, that men might know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins.1 So often did He utter this word that we cannot doubt as to its being the universal prerogative of penitence to hear it. It may be taken for granted that this most blessed formula was among others to be for ever brought to remembrance by the Holy Ghost: though our Lord has, so to speak, reserved it for Himself, If His servants were to pronounce it in His name, it was only as the organs of the Spirit. Jesus was exalted by God to give repentance and forgiveness of sins, of which there are two witnesses: first, the preachers of the Gospel, we are witnesses of these things; secondly, the Holy Ghost Whom God hath given to them that obey Him.2 It is through the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus that we know that there is no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus.3 Our Lord’s forgiveness, for it is His, His Agent evermore pronounces 1 Matthew 9:6; 2 Acts 5:31-32; 3 Romans 8:1-2

2. One of His names is the Spirit of adoption. Though it is our own spirit regenerate that as it were naturally says Abba, Father,1 it is the Holy Spirit in our spirit: the distinction between the regenerate spirit and the Holy Spirit is nearly lost in the New Testament. The Spirit Itself beareth

witness with our spirit:2 summartureí toó pneúmati heemoó. He mingles His life and breath with ours: we cry Father, yet not we but the Spirit in us and with us. The sun preserves the distinction, but it is lost again in the filial cry 1 Galatians 4:6; 2 Romans 8:16

3. In the temple of Christian privilege, the Spirit is a silent seal of consecration: ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise.1 This is the personal Spirit of witness, WHO is the earnest, os, and concerning Whom we are exhorted, grieve not the Holy Spirit of God.2 Mark that it is the temple-epistle which alludes to the sealing, and mentions no other witness of the Spirit, though this one includes and perfects all the rest 1 Ephesians 1:13; 2 Ephesians 4:30 ASSURANCE AND CONFIDENCE The certitude of the believer is constantly referred to by two terms: assurance and confidence. These may be considered first as corresponding to each other, and then as united: the former being the certitude of the inner man, the latter the expression of it in the outer life I. The instances wherein the former, pleeroforia, is used are three, which must be observed in their order

1. St. Paul, in his First Epistle, speaks of the Gospel having come to the Thessalonians in much assurance:1 explained afterwards as the Word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe.2 This is the internal assurance of which he speaks as the being sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, esfragistheete, after that ye believed,3 pisteusantes, on their believing, and it must be observed that the term used connotes both the sealing for God and the sealing of the truth to the believer himself. The former meaning is more in harmony with other instances of its use in the New Testament, but the latter cannot be excluded; it is indeed preferred by many expositors, who seem to confound the sealing of the truth to the mind with the sealing of the mind receiving it

Believers are assured of the Word of Truth of the Gospel of salvation on their believing, and this their assurance is their seal for God. They retain this confidence, and always draw near in full assurance of faith,4 having their hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience. This is wrought by the Spirit; it is not of the essence of faith itself but its highest prerogative; it is the general privilege of those who truly believe 1 1 Thessalonians 1:5; 2 1 Thessalonians 2:13; 3 Ephesians 1:13; 4 Hebrews 10:22 2. As it respects the future faith is hope: its confidence somewhat changes its character

Absolute confidence as to the present, it may increase as it regards the future. And we desire that every one of you do show the same diligence to the full assurance of hope unto the end:1 spoudeén prós teén pleeroforían teés elpídos áchri télous. More and more full as the toil or labor of love2 increases, it never outgrows hope. It becomes indeed the full assurance of hope: a subtle and most beautiful expression that experience only can comprehend: the substantiation of things hoped for 1 Hebrews 6:10-11; 2 1 Thessalonians 1:3

3. Once only is the full assurance of understanding spoken of: St. Paul prays on behalf of the Colossians that they might add to the two other kinds of assurance an abounding and undimmed confidence of the understanding, suneseoos, in all the truths that belong to the mystery of God,1 which is Christ. It imports that it is the privilege of all who receive Christ to have an intellectual and experimental hold of Him, and of the whole circle of His doctrine. They know truth, as truth is in Jesus:2 that is, not only the truth but truth

They have the highest knowledge which is the knowledge of faith, they have such faith in this Object as makes it the certitude of knowledge. This is that TESTIMONIUM SPIRITUS SANCTI which the old confessions held; the seal of the Holy Ghost confirming to the believer the; verity of the Christian Faith, without which all belief of the understanding is dead 1 Colossians 2:2; 2 Ephesians 4:21 II. The latter, parrhesia, occurs in remarkable correspondence with the former

1. There is in the New Testament a parrhesia for each pleeroforias, the external profession of that internal assurance. We are exhorted to come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy:1 the confidence with which we ask for the mercy and seasonable help we still and always need is the confidence of uttered boldness. This is equivalent to the outward expression of inward confidence in our sympathizing High Priest: let us hold fast our profession. The inward and outward assurance go together, or are united at the foot of the throne. We have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of Him:2 a forcible expression in which faith, its assurance, and its confident speech to God are delicately distinguished. And this is the confidence that we have in Him,3 pros auton: this pros has a very wide meaning; it is the strongest preposition that could be used to signify the intimate familiarity of trust. Here then is the confident speech of the full assurance of faith 1 Hebrews 4:14; Hebrews 4:16; 2 Ephesians 3:12; 3 1 John 5:14

2. Cast not away therefore your confidence,1 teen parreesian: this is the confidence of hope, for ye have need of patience; of that hope wherein faith is the substance of things hoped for.2 Again: And now, little children, abide in Him, that, when He shall appear, we may have confidence, parreesian: may not have lost it, not be ashamed before Him at His coming.3 Faith is certain now, as hope it is conditionally certain, and must persevere if it is not to be made ashamed. Here then is the confident expectation and bold expression of the full assurance of hope 1 Hebrews 10:35-36; 2 Hebrews 11:1; 3 1 John 2:28

3. Lastly, the confidence and boldness of confession answers to the full assurance of understanding. They that have used the office of a deacon well purchase to themselves a good degree and great boldness,1 parreesian polleen, in the faith of Christ Jesus. The deacon's reward of fidelity is the blessing of an unfaltering confidence in the truth of what he preaches. When the Apostle says, Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech,2 parreesia, he means that steadfast and tranquil proclamation which the sight of the unveiled Christ inspires. As the boldness of hope increases so also the confidence of the understanding. The transcendent blessing of faith and hope and understanding is one in this boldness of confession which believes and does not tremble, which believes and is raised above all shadow of doubt 1 1 Timothy 3:13; 2 2 Corinthians 3:12

III. The Epistle to the Hebrews, which has given us so many illustrations of our doctrine, sums up its own teaching of assurance and boldness at the close, in a sentence which drops the two words but retains their meaning: just as it sums up its doctrine of the altar and temple in new terms: We have an altar!1 éstin dé pístis elpizoménoon hupóstasis pragmátoon élengchos ou blepoménoon.2 The great chapter of faith contains its full assurance of present acceptance, its full assurance of a conditional hope, and its full assurance of understanding as to the three supreme articles of all faith, concerning God that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him,3 concerning the Gospel Righteousness which is by faith, and concerning the better country of everlasting life in which all the saints shall be made perfect. As we are saved by hope, faith as

hope comes first: faith gives body and substance to things unseen and future for present experience of their reality and trust in their future possession; and its labors to make its assurance of hope perfect are the subject of the whole chapter and make the two economies of grace one. The entire strain witnesses the good confession of faith, the parreesia of its pleeroforia 1 Hebrews 13:10; 2 Hebrews 11:1; 3 Hebrews 11:6-7; Hebrews 11:40 THE TESTIMONY OF OUR OWN SPIRIT The interior assurance is connected with the external; it guards and confirms it; and is itself guarded and confirmed by the evidence of the fruits of holiness, or the testimony of a conscience void of offence. This may be called the witness of our own spirit, though Scripture does not so term it

1. The direct assurance or witness of the Holy Spirit rests generally upon the indirect witness of the external pledges. (1) There may be occasional departures from this law: for instance, where the Gospel vocation is independent of the Christian Church and its organization; where, in certain transcendent and irregular dealings of Divine grace, the soul is rapt into a region higher than the appointed ordinances. The ordinary public means of grace, including the Sacraments, may seem occasionally to be only indirectly connected with the soul's assurance. (2) But the Word of God and prayer are invariably the vehicle, instrument, and channel for His impartation of assurance: it is in answer to prayer, sometimes solitary and sometimes only ejaculatory; and generally through the application to the soul of the promises of the Holy Scripture. We also joy in God through our Lord, Jesus Christ, by Whom we have now received the Atonement:1 the objective Atonement provided for all men in Christ must be received and internally appropriated; and without this appropriation, through faith in the Word of reconciliation, there can be no confidence towards God. Concerning this reception it is said that the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us:2 shed abroad in the consciousness 1 Romans 5:11; 2 Romans 5:5

2. This is the seal set by the soul itself in its experience, to the verity and value of the external pledges. Receiving the testimony given in the Word and Sacraments to a heavenly grace provided for man, the satisfied believer, finding in himself the Spirit's own assurance, having received His testimony, hath set to his seal that God is true:1 hath added his own seal to the seal of God. Thus the Spirit's interior seal becomes to those who believe their own seal of the exterior Sacrament: they can say, Now we believe, not because of thy saying; for we have heard Him ourselves.2 1 John 3:33; 2 John 4:42

3. The Spirit's evidence, based on the Word and Sacrament, is guarded by the ethical and moral testimony of the life. Where-ever the assurance of the Spirit is mentioned there is to be found hard by the appeal to the resulting and never absent evidences of devotion, obedience, and charity. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the Spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, in Whom we cry, Abba, Father.1 The former verse gives the test whereby we know that we are the sons of God: the test of our submission to His Spirit The latter gives another test: the voice within us of the Spirit of adoption. Concerning both and united it is said: if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of His. So in St. John's First Epistle, the witnessing, indwelling, and renewing Spirit are one and indistinguishable. Hereby know we that we dwell in Him2—accepted in the Beloved— and He in us—working out our holiness—because He hath given us of His Spirit. God the Holy Ghost does not in His testimony supersede conscience: He honors that ancient representative of the Divine voice within the nature of man; and never disjoin? His evidence from that of the subjective moral

consciousness which condemns or approves— in this case approves—according to the standard of law written on the heart, or the conscience objective. He is indeed greater than our heart3—or conscience— and knoweth all things. He knoweth the mystery of the Atonement and may silence the condemning heart. But if he assures of pardon He commits the assurance to the conscience as its guardian; so that if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence towards God.4 The same Apostle who said, We, joy in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, by Whom we have now received the Atonement, kauchoomenoi, said also, For our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience: kaucheesis heemoon. The repetition of this expressive word deserves to be considered. The very rejoicing which the Holy Ghost inspires by shedding the love of God abroad in the heart reappears as the rejoicing of the regenerate soul conscious only of walking by the grace of God, in simplicity and godly sincerity.5 1Romans 8:14-15; 2 1 John 4:13; 3 1 John 3:20-21; 4 Romans 5:11; 5 2 Corinthians 1:12

4. Thus, God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of His counsel,1 hath given seal upon seal, pledge upon pledge. The Holy Ghost, the Parakleetos, gives us strong consolation, ischuran parakleesin. There are the silent pledges in which each emblem being dead yet speaketh: there is the inward personal assurance, the Sacrament in the heart; there is the confirming attesting witness of the life; and, over all, as heaven is over all, the Risen Son of Man, the Crucified Mediator upon earth who is in the Holiest our Living Surety, Who hath entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.2 1 Hebrews 6:17-18; 2 Hebrews 9:24

HISTORICAL

Bringing the several Confessions to this standard of doctrine, and testing them by this one article of assurance, we find many variations of more or less significance

I. The Sacramentarian doctrine of assurance contains some most important elements of truth, as has been seen, but some errors also, which may be noted in the following tendencies

1. In Romanism and in Romanising theories it makes the evidence of salvation a concomitant of the sacrament of Penance, or of the priestly absolution; and this, when received, is fitful and occasional, and dependent on the contingency of a sufficient compliance with the conditions. It falls very much below the dignity and blessedness of a direct communication of the Eternal Spirit to the spirit of the believer in Christ

2. The Sacramental theory in general denies rightly that to any mortal is given the assurance of final acceptance; the day of judgment being the sealing revelation, and last assurance of safety: looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life.1 But it too often refuses to admit a state of present certainty as included in the provisions of the Christian covenant, at least as the common privilege of all who believe

1 Jude 1:21

3. It has introduced a special charisma or gift of assurance of Perseverance, a sealing for the elect of the Elect: thus combining in one extraordinary privilege the assurance of faith for the present and that of hope for the future, or, in other words, adding to the witness of the Spirit a pledge of final perseverance

4. In some forms it has sunk much below the true doctrine. As, for instance, among those who so far recoil from the fanaticism, as they term it, of the doctrine of assurance as to deny altogether the possibility of its attainment? This is sometimes an exaggeration of ascetic humility, sometimes an irrational recoil from enthusiasm, and sometimes the result of an undue preponderance given to the sterner side of probation II. Mysticism has always abounded in its own peculiar developments of the doctrine of probationary assurance

1. Its best and purest theology has generally maintained a present assurance of faith, generally though not always imparted, but without the absolute assurance as to the future

It has sometimes undervalued the objective grounds of confidence in its preference for the internal light. Mysticism has been in all ages either avowedly or virtually a reaction and protest against superstitious dependence on the external props of Christian certitude, and such exaggeration of the soleness of the inward witness was to be expected. It is seen among the Pietists of Germany, among the Friends, and occasionally among the less instructed Methodists: in fact, among all who have been suddenly aroused by strong tides of religious revival from indifference or from ceremonialism to the intense pursuit of personal salvation

2. The extravagant Mystics of the Illuminist and Quietist types erred exceedingly: the former, forgetting the conditions of assurance, repentance, and faith; the latter, making the perfection of religion to consist in an absolute indifference to assurance and evidence and feeling of every kind. Their doctrine of disinterested love, pressed to the extreme of the utter extinction of desire of heaven and fear of hell, overturns the very foundation of any theory of personal evidence of salvation

III. The doctrine of Assurance, taught by what may be called the Calvinistic system, on the one hand, falls below the standard of Scripture, while, on the other, it goes beyond its plain teaching. Both the defect and the excess must be studied

1. It falls below the calm and steadfast confidence which the whole New Testament declares to be the privilege for the present moment of him who believes in Christ.

(1) It distinguishes too sharply between assurance and faith, and is disposed rather to overvalue the external grounds of confidence in comparison of the internal. Certainly faith may exist without assurance; nor is assurance absolutely and unconditionally necessary to salvation. But, though faith itself has no reflex thought of itself, looking only at Christ, it is in its perfect saving energy accompanied by the assurance which is indeed indistinguishable from faith in its highest exercise. He loved me and gave Himself for me1 was the testimony of St. Paul, who, though he spoke in this style of appropriating confidence only once, evidently intended to define by its highest privilege the Christian’s true faith of the Son of God in which he lives.

(2) It makes assurance a special privilege of the few who through much discipline attain it as a gift of God; and, accordingly, dwells too much on the alternations and fluctuations of experience to which it pleases God for the trial of their constancy to subject believers.

(3) It confounds the assurance of present faith with the assurance of hope: making the former only the confidence that Jesus is what He is declared to be generally, and the latter the confidence in personal salvation. That distinction is contrary to Scripture, which does not present as the object of

saving faith only Christ's Person, work, and ability, and willingness to save us generally if we believe, but also His present relation to us individually as a Savior. Until faith embraces the Lord as a personal Deliverer it is not that faith in its integrity of which we now speak. Granted that a firm appropriating trust in Christ, apart from the evidence of it, insures salvation, as salvation is an objective act of God, subjective or experienced salvation has no meaning without the knowledge of it. The word has not its full significance and its perfect rights until the objective and the subjective blend. This will be abundantly clear if we change the expression into justification or pardon or adoption or life from the dead. These blessings pronounced by God must be heard by man, or they are not truly his. Hence the Word of God bids those who are supposed to have the assurance of present faith to confirm continually the confidence of their hope by holy living 1 Galatians 2:20

2. On the other hand, it goes beyond the standard of Scripture. When once attained, the assurance is indefectible: while the essence of saving faith is regarded as the assurance that Christ generally is all that He is set forth, and will do all that He promises—a faith therefore, we repeat, independent as such of any personal appropriation—the assurance of our own personal salvation is an independent fruit of faith, and a high attainment of the spiritual life. It is the Divinely inwrought confidence of an eternal salvation, and the exhortation not to cast away its confidence is, if not superfluous, only a prudential expedient for moral discipline. But this subject belongs to our next section

3. Both the defect and excess of the doctrine, and also its true points, are seen in the following words of the Westminster Confession: " This infallible assurance doth not so belong to the essence of faith, but that a true believer may wait long, and conflict with many difficulties, before he be partaker of it: yet, being enabled by the Spirit to know the things which are freely given him of God, he may, without extraordinary revelation, in the right use of ordinary means, attain thereunto. And therefore it is the duty of everyone to give all diligence to make his calling and election sure." Here is a certain inconsistency in making a free gift the result of diligent seeking. When it is added that " true believers may have the assurance of their salvation divers ways shaken," that is true of all assurance, though not precisely in the sense of this document

IV. Methodism has done much to clear the Scriptural doctrine of Assurance from the misapprehensions that have obscured it in its system of religious teaching the following points are made prominent and sharply defined 1. It is asserted to be the COMMON PRIVILEGE of all who believe; being the accompaniment of every blessing of the Christian covenant: not, indeed, of the essence of justifying faith, but a result of it that may be expected, and should be sought

(1.) Mr. Wesley says on the former subject: "Is justifying faith a sense of pardon? Negatur. 1. Everyone is deeply concerned to understand this question well; but Preachers most of all. 2. By justifying faith I mean that faith which whosoever hath not is under the wrath and the curse of God. By a sense of pardon I mean a distinct explicit assurance that my sins are forgiven. I allow (1) that there is an explicit assurance;

(2) that it is the common privilege of real Christians;

(3) that it is the proper Christian Faith which 'purifieth the heart' and 'over-cometh the world.' But I cannot allow that justifying faith is such an assurance, or necessarily connected therewith. 3.

Because if justifying faith necessarily implies such an explicit assurance of pardon, then everyone who has it not and everyone so long as he has it not is under the wrath and the curse of God. But this is a supposition contrary to Scripture as well as to experience. Contrary to Isaiah 1:10, and Acts 10:34-35. Again, the assertion justifying faith is a sense of pardon/ is contrary to reason: it is flatly absurd. For how can a sense of pardon be the condition of our receiving it?"

(2.) As to the latter: " The second inference is, let none rest in any supposed fruit of the Spirit without the witness. There may be foretastes of joy, of peace, of love, and those not delusive, but really from God, long before we have; the witness in ourselves; before the Spirit of God witnesses with our spirits that we have redemption in the blood of Jesus, even the forgiveness of sins.' Yea, there may be a degree of longsuffering, of gentleness, of fidelity, meekness, temperance, (not a shadow thereof, but a real degree, by the preventing grace of God,) before we 'are accepted in the Beloved,' and, consequently, before we have a testimony of our acceptance: but it is by no means advisable to rest here; it is at the peril of our souls if we do. If we are wise, we shall be continually crying to God, until His Spirit cry in our heart, Abba, Father!' This is the privilege of all the children of God, and without this we can never be assured that we are His children

Without this we cannot retain a steady peace, nor avoid perplexing doubts and fears. But when we have once received this Spirit of adoption, this ' peace, which passcth all understanding/ and which expels all painful doubt and fear, will ' keep our hearts and minds in Christ Jesus.' And when this has brought forth its genuine fruit, all inward and outward holiness, it is undoubtedly the will of Him that calleth us, to give us always what He has once given; so that there is no need that we should ever more be deprived of either the testimony of God's Spirit, or the testimony of our own, the consciousness of our walking in all righteousness and true holiness."

(3.) He also in many passages of his writings shows that the testimony of the Spirit is borne to our justification, adoption and sanctification severally and respectively. As to the two former no evidence is needed: as to the witness of sanctification he says: "To this confidence, that God is both able and willing to sanctify us now, there needs to be added one thing more, —a Divine evidence and conviction that He doeth it. In that hour it is done, God says to the inmost soul, ' According to thy faith be it unto thee!' Then the soul is pure from every spot of sin; it is clean ' from all unrighteousness/ The believer then experiences the deep meaning of those solemn words, 'If we walk in the light as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin.'" Here two remarks must be made. The distinction maintained above, between the faith and its assurance, still holds good. By the " conviction that He doeth it" is meant the certainty conveyed to the soul that the work of entire sanctification is wrought. The " evidence " that is the perfection of faith itself, and the confidence that it has its object, are not always kept asunder in the Sermons. But it is undoubted that Mr. Wesley taught that the witness of finished sanctification is to be expected. Again, by " sanctify" here he means entirely sanctify: not being always careful to observe his own rule on the subject. There is no text of Scripture that directly promises the knowledge of so great an internal work; but none is necessary. It is the prerogative of the Holy Spirit to make His indwelling and work evident to the consciousness: " God 'sealeth us with the Spirit of promise' by giving us ' the full assurance of hope/ such a confidence of receiving all the promises of God, as excludes the possibility of doubting; with that Holy Spirit, by universal holiness, stamping the whole image of God on our hearts." The subject of this last assurance will come up again. Meanwhile, it is enough to say that

the Methodist doctrine of the Spirit's witness covers the whole ground of the Spirit's work. It rests upon the firm foundation of the Scripture that we know the things that are freely given unto us of God.1 The assurance in the several departments of covenant blessing may bear various characters. Given to the pardoned sinner it is a sense of unspeakable relief to the conscience; in the heart of the adopted child it is the irrepressible filial confidence; in the regenerate spirit sanctified to God it is the silent seal of a Divine indwelling, abiding in the soul as the awful sense of the Triune God within and deepening into the assurance that He fills the whole heart, or the witness of entire sanctification 1 1 Corinthians 2:12

2. It is the DIRECT WITNESS of the Spirit, not independent of the objective and external grounds of assurance, but given through them, or indeed without them, directly to the soul. " The sum of all is this: The testimony of the Spirit is an inward impression on the souls of believers, whereby the Spirit of God directly testifies to their spirit, that they are children of God. And it is not questioned, whether there is a testimony of the Spirit; but whether there is any direct testimony; whether there is any other than that which arises from a consciousness of the fruit of the Spirit. We believe there is; because this is the plain natural meaning of the text, illustrated both by the preceding words and by the parallel passage in the Epistle to the Galatians; because, in the nature of the thing, the testimony must precede the fruit which springs from it; and, because this plain meaning of the Word of God is confirmed by the experience of innumerable children of God; yea, and by the experience of all who are convinced of sin, who can never rest till they have a direct witness; and even of the children of the world, who, not having the witness in themselves, one and all declare, none can know his sins forgiven." The directness or immediateness of this testimony was contended against in the early days of Methodism, as it has been opposed, more or less, in all ages. The opposition, however, was of two kinds. Some denied the possibility on the general ground that there could be no security against enthusiasm. But the Spirit within the spirit of man is to all who know God the most real of all realities. Others insisted that there could be no such witness apart from the testimony of the consciousness of a sincere use of the external means of grace, and obedience to the commandments of God: in other words, that the testimony of the Spirit must in the nature of things be indirect if the means of grace are the objective grounds of assurance. But there are some plain passages concerning the testimony which expressly preclude the possibility that it is borne through the medium of any symbol or sacrament

Whatever voice, or word, or ordinance may be employed—each and all may be employed, and the Word in some form always—the assurance must ultimately be conveyed direct from Spirit to spirit. Mr. "Wesley in his candor understates his argument again and again. He deals with an objector thus: " ' But the direct witness is never referred to in the Book of God.' Not as standing alone; not as a single witness; but as connected with the other; as giving a joint testimony; testifying with our spirit, that we are children of God." Strictly speaking, there is no passage which more absolutely declares the direct and sole testimony of the Holy Ghost. The summarturei is indeed a joint testimony; but our own spirit is not supposed to bring its inferences to be confirmed; rather the witness of the Holy Ghost to our adoption is borne through the spirit of our new regenerate life. Elsewhere Mr. Wesley says, with more 'precision: " the preposition sun only denoting that He witnesses this at the same time that He enables us to cry Abba, Father. But I contend not; seeing so many other texts, with the experience of all real Christians, sufficiently evince that there is in every believer both the testimony of God's Spirit, and the testimony of his own, that he is a child of

God." These last words suggest the remark that the Methodist doctrine is unfairly dealt with when it is supposed to rest upon one, two, or three cardinal passages. The Sermon quoted ranges through a wide variety of Scriptural proofs; and it does not include all Hard by the words here and habitually quoted there are others which even yet more strongly declare the Mystery of the inward assurance of the child of God: that, namely, which speaks of the Searcher of hearts hearing the voice of the interceding Spirit in the inmost consciousness of His suffering children

3. It is always confirmed by the accompaniment of the INDIRECT WITNESS, or testimony of the conscience on the evidence of a sincere life. The latter phrase seems preferable for the reason just assigned. Though Mr. Wesley writes of it as " The Witness of our own spirit" his discourse is or the characteristics of a good conscience. " Neither is it questioned whether there is an indirect witness or testimony, that we are the children of God. This is nearly, if not exactly, the same with the testimony of a good conscience towards God; and is the result of reason, or reflection on what we feel in our own souls. Strictly speaking, it is a conclusion drawn partly from the Word of God, and partly from our own experience. The Word of God says, everyone who has the fruit of the Spirit is a child of God; experience, or inward consciousness, tells me that I have the fruit of the Spirit; and hence I naturally conclude, 'Therefore I am a child of God/" This witness is indirect as a conclusion: but as the consciousness of experience, or of conscience, which is the moral consciousness, it is as direct as that of the Spirit Himself, who may be said to bear witness together with our conscience. The two are united ever in the perfect experience of the Christian. But both admit of variations. " Nor do we assert that there can be any real testimony of the Spirit without the fruit of the Spirit. We assert, on the contrary, that the fruit of the Spirit immediately springs from this testimony: not always indeed in the same degree, even when the testimony is first given; and much less afterwards. Neither joy nor peace is always at one stay; no, nor love; as neither is the testimony itself always equally strong and clear." None of the doctrines to which Methodism gives prominence is more diligently fenced and defended from the imputation of fanaticism than this of the direct and indirect witness of the Holy Spirit THE GRACE OF PERSEVERANCE

Provision is made in the Christian covenant for the maintenance of religion in the soul to the end. The source of this grace is the effectual intercession of Christ, caring for His own. The manifestation of it is the all-sufficient power of the Holy Spirit; in its nature and operation it is superabundant and persistent; not indefectible however, but conditional on perseverance in fidelity The general subject belongs to the Ethics as well as to the Doctrines of Redemption. So far as it belongs to doctrine, two things must be noted. First, there is a specific GRACE OF PERSEVERANCE provided in the Christian covenant which is too often forgotten in the ardor of controversy: this we must dwell upon briefly. Secondly, the chief stress of the treatment must needs be laid on the polemical or historical aspect of it: that is, in the confutation of the conventional dogma of FINAL PERSEVERANCE PERSEVERINGGRACE IN ITS GROUND

Christ's eternal love to His own, as proved once for all in His supreme sacrifice, is the pledge of persevering grace being granted by Him according to all the varieties of their need. That love shows itself in special and effectual intercession for them: intercession which is the Redeemer's expressed will, and also His prayer giving efficacy to ours

1. There is a sense in which the Lord regards the body of believers as His own for time and for eternity. By His atonement He has secured them for Himself, and secured for them every provision for eternal salvation. They are His portion of the human race; and their continuance in grace is provided for: not only for their own sake but also for His. He waits to rejoice over them in heaven as His purchased possession,1 as His heritage or the portion that falleth to Him: And all Mine are Thine, and Thine are Mine.2 There is no more impressive and affecting representation of the bond between Christians and Christ their Head than this, that they are given Him of the Father 1 Ephesians 1:14; 2 John 17:10

2. For this body, as distinguished from the world, He intercedes. His will is their eternal salvation. Father, I will that, theloo hina, they also, whom Thou hast given Me, be with Me where IAmos 1:1-15 His one Divine reward for His Divine-human obedience is the salvation of His own. It also takes a human form: the Father highly exalted Him and gave Him supreme dominion. He did not Himself stipulate for this; He never even seems to glance beyond this world for His recompense; but He does most expressly lay claim to His people as His inheritance; satisfied with them, but with nothing less than they: of all which He hath given Me I should lose nothing.2 Death seems to appropriate part of them; but death must relinquish its prey: I will raise it up again at the last day. His request or intercession also—almost as strong as His will—is for their grace unto perseverance. I pray not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from the evil.3 And in praying—eroto—for sufficient grace unto perseverance, our Lord included all His own to the end of time: not simply as His own, however, but as believers, for them also which shall believe on Me.4 They are His heritage, but as believing in Him: not one without the other 1 John 17:24; 2 John 6:39; 3 John 17:15; 4 John 17:20

3. Hence, nothing is more certain than the perseverance of those who continue in that body. They shall never perish; neither shall any pluck them out of My hand.1 The, Father and the Son in eternal essence one, are united in the counsel of redemption. But there is a special emphasis upon their unity in the accomplishment of the design of grace as to the elect: I and My Father are One.2 The members of Christ's mystical body are eternally foreknown, and grace will be found to have been sufficiently provided for their whole estate of probation. He who redeemed the world especially redeemed the Church; and known unto Him from the beginning was the whole contest and diversified trial through which His Church must become eternally His. Therefore He added to the treasure of His redeeming merit the continual energy of His active intercession, providing grace for every time of need. The High Priest of mankind is especially the Advocate of His people: If any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father... Who is the Propitiation for the sins of the world.3 1 John 10:28; 2 John 10:30; 3 1 John 2:1-2 PERSEVERING GRACE IN ITSMANIFESTATION The grace of Perseverance is the constant impartation of the Holy Ghost: indwelling as a seal and bringing effectual succor in every time of need

I. St. Paul, in one of those passages into which he condenses the entire substance of Gospel privilege, says: in Whom also after that ye believed ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, Which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession.1 As to God, the Spirit is His seal on the regenerate soul. As to the believer, the Spirit is to him the earnest of a future inheritance. As to Christ, the Spirit is His representative in the soul until He redeems His possession. But it is remarkable that in the Epistle which mentions most emphatically the seal of the Spirit, of the personal Indweller, we have the most urgent exhortation, grieve not the Holy

Spirit.2 Though nothing in this tranquil Epistle is said of the possibility of the seal being broken, nothing is said as to its being inviolable. Be not ye therefore partakers with them3 is an injunction which seems to refer as much to the wrath of God as to these things which caused it: have no participation with them, either in their doings or in the punishment of those doings. In another document, which teaches the same doctrine of the sealing Spirit, we read: If any man destroy the temple of God, Mm shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.4 1 Ephesians 1:13-14; 2 Ephesians 4:30; 3 Ephesians 5:6-7; 4 1 Corinthians 3:7 II. Persevering grace is imparted for every requirement of our infirmity, and that in three ways

1. It is the grace of watchfulness to keep what is attained: I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not.1 This was said to one who failed in part: and did not wholly fail only because grace was given to him which he used. The grace he received taught him the need of watchfulness. He was bidden, when converted, strengthen thy brethren; and his Epistles are specially adapted to encourage confidence in the riches of the grace of Christ, the Keeper of Israel, at the same time that they lay very great stress upon the humility that receives and the diligence that uses His effectual grace. Be sober, be vigilant follows hard upon Casting all your care upon Him; for He careth for you.2 A watchful spirit is the gift of God; but its watchfulness is its own use of that gift 1 Luke 22:31-32; 2 1 Peter 5:7-8

2. It is the manifold grace which enables the soul to accomplish every duty of life. God is able to make all grace abound toward you, that ye, always having all sufficiency in all things, may abound to every good work:1 this applies not only to the duty of liberality, but to every duty. Having all-sufficiency from God we must abound in our own diligence

There is no commandment without promise: promise of reward for obedience, and promise of help to perform. But the grace which strengthens for endlessly diversified duty is pledged to those and to those only who use it. Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure.2 The good pleasure which is here the spring and the rule of the Divine working in us must become our own good pleasure. St. Paul elsewhere gives us a variation on this great saying. We pray always for you that our God may . . . fulfill every desire of goodness and every work of faith with power.3 1 2 Corinthians 9:8; 2 Php 2:12-13; 3 2 Thessalonians 1:11

3. It is the effectual grace of support that enables the believer to sustain the pressure of affliction and to endure all the will of God. The Apostle’s prayer for the Colossians is, that they might be strengthened with all might, according to His glorious power, unto all patience and longsuffering with joyfulness.1 But another Apostle says that the grace which enables the soul to sustain what is a sharper test than any Satan can apply—the visitation of Providence, and the spiritual suffering which precedes the death of the body of sin in conformity with Christ who suffered for us in the flesh2—is to be used as our own amour, not God’s alone: Arm yourselves likewise with the same mind. Finally, however, when we have done and suffered all, and while we are doing and suffering all, persevering grace is the Divine gift: But the God of all grace. Who hath called you to His eternal glory in Christ \Jesus\ after that ye have suffered awhile, will make perfect, stablish, strengthen, [settle] you.3 .1 Colossians 1:11; 2 1 Peter 4:1; 3 1 Peter 5:10 PERSEVERING GRACE IN ITSNATUREAND OPERATION This grace is, as has been seen, strong and persistent; but mighty and enduring as it is, it is still conditional

I. However viewed, the grace of Christ towards His own, and the power of the Holy Spirit within them, go far to secure absolutely the final salvation of the regenerate. The surpassing and unlimited love of the Redeemer, the reluctance of the Spirit to forsake the work of His hands, the plenitude of the means of grace, the growing blessedness of true religion, the might of intercessory prayer both Divine and human, the feebleness of the Lord's enemies in comparison of His lightest influence, all conspire to show that the utter relapse and final ruin of a regenerate soul is a hard possibility. If the Holy Ghost forsakes the soul for ever which He has once inhabited, such a departure, rendering the place so deeply and unalterably desolate, must be spoken of in the language of the prophet as His strange work, His strangeActs 1:1-26

1 Isaiah 28:21

1. This blessed truth explains much in Scripture that seems to declare that the Christian heritage is absolutely secure.

If God be for us, who can be against us?1 Here is both the question of confidence and the apostrophe of defiance. The latter is continued in the glowing words which assert that nothing, sin always excepted, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord 1 Romans 8:31-39

2. It explains the tone of assurance with which the future is looked forward to among the Christians of the New Testament. We are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul.1 There is a drawing back; but we may feel ourselves secure. Hence the strengthener of his brethren, the Apostle of perseverance, bids them make your calling and election sure:2 bebaian humoon. It may be made SURE, and this is the guarantee of assurance. It must be MADE sure, and this is the pith of perseverance 1 Hebrews 10:39; 2 2 Peter 1:10

3. But it must be reconciled with the most positive testimonies that no man in the present life can go beyond the assurance of hope. What a man seeth, why doth he yet hope far?1 The solitary passage in the New Testament which describes faith and hope as one and interchangeable gives the formula of the true doctrine. Faith is the assurance of things hoped for:2 the present substantial realization of what is ours only in hope. And very impressive is the fact that St. Paul in two other passages describes Christian hope as keeping pace in its measures with the increase of faith: Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope through the power of the Holy Ghost;3 and in another with the increase of experience: tribulation worketh patience, and patience probation, and probation hope. This hope maketh not ashamed; but no other reason of this is given than that the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost.4 1 Romans 8:24; 2 Hebrews 11:1; 3 Romans 15:13; 4 Romans 5:3-5 II. The grace of continuance is conditional, notwithstanding all that has been said

Unconditional grace may be spoken of as provided for the world as such, and for the mystical Church as such: as received by individuals it is conditional. Whether in the beginning of preliminary life, or in the mature life of the regenerate, or in the most confirmed saints, its very nature as grace is bound up with the condition that it is used by the free concurrence of him who receives it

1. All grace of God is unconditional in its impartation to the old race in Adam, and to the new race in Christ. The grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath

abounded unto many.1 As all mankind share the displeasure of God caused by sin, so all share the beginnings of His mercy drawing them to repentance. This preliminary grace, whether manifest through its appointed means or imperceptible in its mysterious influence on the human heart, is unconditional. So also the plenary gifts of grace, which all believers receive out of His fullness,2 are unconditionally bestowed on the mystical body of Christ, whatever and of whomsoever composed that body may be The Church, as such, is a predestined object of our Lord's eternal complacency. Hence the language of the Scripture runs in the strain of indefectible gift of grace to the body and fellowship of believers as foreseen and predestinated from the foundation of the world 1 Romans 5:15; 2 John 1:16

2. But all grace, whether preliminary or saving, is as it concerns the individual, and with respect to its effectual operation, conditional. Therefore St. Paul's exhortation, beseeching us that we receive not the grace of God in vain:1 received freely in one sense and as irresistible, in another sense it may be received in vain. Unless eis kenon ceases to mean to no purpose, or without result, and unless it can be shown that St. Paul was addressing spurious Christians, saving grace is not irremissible, But he certainly addressed, by every token in the context, true believers in Christ, when he uttered this most impressive appeal 1 2 Corinthians 6:1 HISTORICAL AND CONTROVERSIAL The conventional dogma of Final Perseverance belongs to the Augustinian or Calvinistic type of doctrine. There have been sundry attempts to attach this doctrine to other systems, but they have been vain : it comports with no other theory of the economy of grace than which limits it to a definite and elect number, predetermined in the councils of eternity

Supposing redemption to be universal, and the offer of grace free for all, and salvation possible to every man, some have also supposed that the grace of an effectual regeneration must needs be indefectible and eternal. But a more thorough examination of the Christian covenant tends to show that this generous interpretation of the doctrine of persevering grace cannot be made consistent with the freedom of will and personal responsibility which lie at the foundation of universal redemption. The arguments for the indefectibility of grace in the Elect are such as rest, first upon the nature of the Christian Covenant, and then upon misunderstood Scriptures THE COVENANT OF REDEMPTION

What is called Final Perseverance, or the doctrine that grace can never be finally lost, is defended generally not so much by Scripture as by the necessary principles of the socalled Covenant of Redemption. So absolute and all-pervading in this view of the Gospel is the idea of a fixed and unalterable division of mankind that it is made a canon to which the interpretation of every passage of Scripture must conform. What seems to be wrong in these principles has been already indicated, but may be summarized once more

1. The Absolute sovereignty of the Divine will presides over an imaginary covenant between the Father and the Son before time began; a certain number were to be redeemed and given to the Redeemer as the fruit and reward of His atoning submission; and fidelity to that covenant demands the immunity from possible fall of all who were included in the portion of Christ. There is no Scriptural evidence of such an unconditional covenant, though there is a catholic truth of inestimable importance underlying the error. The Redeemer has indeed His portion of mankind divided to Him; but not by an absolutely sovereign and despotic disposal of the eternal destinies of men. He rejoices over those who were given Him of the Father; but He laments over one of them

as lost. Moreover He speaks of them as being drawn to Him one by one, and promises them: him that cometh to Me I will in no wise cast out. Not in this style would He speak of those who were unconditionally His before time began. He prays for the Glory which He had before the foundation of the world, but not for the people who were then assigned to Him

1 John 6:37

2. The relation of Christ to those thus given Him is supposed to be such that their salvation is assured. He is their Substitute and Surety, and more than their Representative: He assumes their place at all points; suffers for them, obeys for them, and insures them an eternal sanctity. We have seen that the Saviour's righteousness is not otherwise imputed to His people than as their sin was imputed to Him. We may conceive of an imputation of the active righteousness in the sense that we are reckoned righteous as well as forgiven; but even of that the Scripture does not so speak. We are predestinated elect, St. Peter says, only through sanctification of the Spirit.1

1 1 Peter 1:2

3. The irresistibility of Divine grace as an operation of the Spirit within the soul is necessary to the dogma of Final Perseverance. But grace, as such, is never represented as irresistible: it is free in God, and to be freely received by man. Like the will it cannot tolerate the idea of constraint, by its very name. God is irresistible; and His will is irresistible; but not His grace, which is only His undeserved lovingkindness moving on free intelligences. His will redeemed the world; and that will was irresistible. The grace that bringeth salvation to all men1 was absolute and unconditional; though even that grace may be received in vain2 by individuals. As working within the heart it is an influence of discipline: it teacheth us the way of holiness, paideuei 1 Titus 2:11; 2 2 Corinthians 9:1

4. The distinction between the special grace that insures salvation and the common grace that may be, and by the terms must be, in many cases, unprofitable, is arbitrary. No grace of God should be called common: its slightest influence may lead to heaven, and is given with that intention. There is no necessity in the system more hard, no dogma in it more intolerable than that which requires us to believe in a large and most affecting expenditure of the grace of God intentionally insufficient for salvation

5. The gift of Final Perseverance is an unreality, whether in the expression or in the thought which it expresses. Perseverance is an ethical duty. The gift, or charism, of perseverance is bestowed from moment to moment; it is the diligent use of the grace of every hour. That it should be imparted once for all as a blessing of the Christian covenant is a contradiction in terms; and the necessity of choosing such a phrase for the doctrine is an argument against it THE ARGUMENT FROM SCRIPTURE The testimonies of Scripture introduced into this controversy may be divided into two classes: those which the advocates of Final Perseverance use in offensive warfare, and those which they resist when alleged against them. Both classes have been already alluded to; but the importance of the subject demands that they be more formally exhibited in their seeming contrariety

I. Positive declarations of the Bible in favor of the necessary perpetuity of grace are confessedly few. The argument most depended on is as we have seen the nature of the covenant of grace, or the compact between the Father and the Son as already explained The few testimonies to which appeal is made may be referred to the decrees of God, to our Lord's sayings, and to the

Apostolical testimonies as such

1. Whom He called them He also justified, and whom He justified them He also glorified.1 This golden chain, with others like it, only sets forth the order of grace: not a necessary sequence, save in the case of the finally saved; the links are beheld from eternity and not from time. It goes back to what we call the past, proegnoo, He did foreknow; all whom He foreknew, prooorise, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son. Then it goes forward, as we might say, to the end: as if all were accomplished, them He also called, elakese; them He also justified, edikaioose, their adoption and sanctification being included in the image of His Son; and them He also glorified, edoxasen. This representative text stands for all those which refer to the electing and determinate purpose of God: passages which are to be interpreted as speaking in the prospect of an eternal accomplishment already decided in the Divine mind with reference to the believing heirs of grace and glory, therefore as referring not so much to the individual as to the Church viewed in its corporate mystical capacity 1 Romans 8:29-30

2. Our Lord's declarations on this subject are few. His parable of the sheep, of whom He says that they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of My hand,1 must be interpreted in the light of that other of the Vine, whose branches are eternal, while an individual branch might be cast forth and be withered.2 This we shall mark hereafter: meanwhile, our Lord declares of His sheep that as such they shall never lack pasture from Him, nor shall any wrest them from Him. That they may not forsake Him He does not add; nor could that be added by the same lips which testified, severed from Me ye can do nothing 1 John 10:28; 2 John 15:5-6 3. A few typical passages from the Apostles may be adduced: each represents a class, though a very small one

(1.) St. Paul writes: Being confident of this very thing, that He which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ.1 The Apostle, when he speaks of the coming day of Christ, almost invariably has in view the community character of Christians: death was to the individual at least an alternative prospect; it was not so to the Church, which has only before it the coming of Christ. Hence the IN is really equivalent to AMONG you. In any case, the emphasis is in the relation between the beginning and the performing; and the safeguard is supplied in the prayer that ye may be sincere and without offence unto the, day of Christ. Such passages mast have a generous interpretation, but not too generous. It is the will of God to accomplish fully all that He begins in love; but not all the gifts of universal mercy are without repentance: witness its vast miscarriage in those who turn the grace of our God into lasciviousness,2 the grace that bringeth salvation to all men.3 1 Php 1:6-10; 2 Jude 1:4; 3 Titus 2:11

(2.) The only testimony of St. John that can be pressed into the service is this: they went out from us but they were not of us; for, if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.1 He is speaking of Antichrists, teaching without the unction from the Holy One

Comparison with this Apostle's own parable of the Vine will show that he could not refer to a necessary continuing or abiding in Christ, as such 1 1 John 2:19-20

(3.) St. Peter, the Apostle who fell and rose again, whose gentle penalty was, when thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren,1 is naturally appealed to on this question. He has many important sayings in relation to it. All Christian communions hold that doctrine of indefectible grace

and final perseverance which is taught in the word: kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation,2 which indeed contain the whole truth in summary form. As the Atonement is set forth by the Divine counsel independently of man, but made a reality to him only through faith, —Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation by His blood through faith,3 —so the final salvation to which it leads is set forth in the Divine mind for the Church, but becomes personal privilege only through faith. A passage, however, soon follows which has been a classical proof-text, and much relied on, so far that is as isolated texts are relied on in this controversy. It is that of the incorruptible seed. There are two kinds of life mentioned by the writer. Of the one it is said, all flesh is as grass: the glory and beauty of physical or temporal life perisheth. Of the other it is said: begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God which liveth and abideth [for ever].4 The glory and beauty of that life of which Christ says, / am come that they may have life, and may hare it [more] abundantly,5 never passeth away. With St. Peter's text may be compared St. John's, Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for His seed remaineth in him.6 The two passages are strictly parallel; but neither does St. John teach that the incorruptible seed as such makes the regenerate absolutely sinless, nor St. Peter that it absolutely insures eternal life 1 Luke 22:32; 2 1 Peter 1:5; 3 Romans 3:25; 4 1 Peter 1:23; 5 John 10:10; 6 1 John 3:9

II. Many passages running in an opposite direction are so clear as effectually to overturn the high theory of Final Perseverance

1. There are some, indeed, which ought not to be pressed into the controversy on either side. Such are those which refer to the falls of the saints: they might often fall, but not finally, Simon Peter being an instance, with David and Solomon, and many others. Nor should we urge the texts which enforce fidelity, diligence, and watchfulness generally as necessary to salvation. It may be fairly said that the Divine purpose includes the means with the end: the opponents of indefectible grace are glad of an analogous argument when they connect foreknowledge and election. As election is based on foreknowledge, so, might it be said, final perseverance is assured on the foreknowledge of fidelity. Nor should we use those which speak of the apostasy of Judaism or of the fall of the Israelites in the wilderness: apart, that is, from the Apostolic specific application of this latter, which does give a very solemn individual aspect to the admonition. Nor is it right to appeal to the decline and destruction of the Asiatic Churches. All these instances of a final lapse from grace may be referred to communities and not to individuals: here again we must allow our opponents the measure we mete with ourselves. But there is a series of declarations running through the Word of God which the advocates of the irremissibility of grace are obliged to wrest from their obvious signification, or interpret by a special canon of Hermeneutics devised for the purpose

2. There are many sayings which are uttered by God, as it were without specific relation to the redeeming purpose, as the Moral Governor of the universe simply. If thou forsake Him He will cast thee off for ever:1 this expressed a universal principle applicable to all economies, and to all times, and to all unfaithful stewards of the Divine gifts, the unknown prophet who was raised up to rebuke Eli, speaks thus the Divine message: I said indeed . . .. But now the Lord saith, Be it far from Me; for them that honor Me I will honor, and they that despise Me shall be lightly esteemed.2 This is not a theocratic principle only, it is a statement of God's everlasting law. No sophistry can avail to soften the words spoken by God to the children of His people for ever: the righteousness of the righteous shall not deliver him in the day of his transgression.3 Both in the New and in the Old

Testaments God is no-respecter of persons.4 As a Father, He judgeth according to every man's work.5 Our God—even in the Christian covenant—is a consuming fire:6 consuming His people's sins, indeed; but it was not to express such a meaning the word was uttered; it was as a warning to all who, having received the grace of the earlier covenant, reject that of the later 1 1 Chronicles 28:9; 2 1 Samuel 2:30; 3 Ezekiel 33:12; 4 Acts 10:34; 5 1 Peter 1:17; 6 Hebrews 12:29

3. Our Lord has left some clear sayings, recorded by the same Evangelist who has most profoundly exhibited the bond between Christ and His elect. The parable-allegory of the Vine is the pendant of that of the sheep that never perish. Without Me— chooris emou— ye can do nothing.1 If a man abide not in Me, he is cast forth as a branch and is withered.2 This follows the great words of mystical union, Abide in Me, and I in you; the warning therefore is not given to those who heard it as they were Apostles. Nor was the calling of Judas only Apostolic; he was cast forth of the living Vine, and his loss was acknowledged as the separation of one of the elect: those that Thou gavest Me I have kept, and none of them is lost but the son of perdition.3 Three terms are used in relation to Judas which show that he had been one of the objects of the Saviour's grace in common with the other Apostles: he was given to Christ of the Father, he was chosen, and as lost he had partaken of salvation. It may be said that while the Lord was in the world, and especially during His earlier ministry, His teaching did not as yet penetrate to the strict bonds of the eternal covenant. But there is no teaching of His servants on this or any subject higher than His own. And the tone of His instruction from the beginning to the end tends to exactly the opposite of the doctrine of a necessary indefectible grace

Witness the close of the Sermon on the Mount: the last parables of the Talents and the Pounds and the Virgins; and the final Eschatological discourses. We cannot but feel that He speaks, not of a class of persons never really Christians, but of us all. But the series of testimonies to which we here refer belongs rather to the ethics than to the doctrines of the covenant of grace. They are therefore not here quoted and classified 1 John 15:4-6; 2 John 10:28; 3 John 17:12 4. A few of the Apostolical testimonies may be added: each the representative of a considerable class

(1.) The last words of the first Apostolic writer: let him know that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall cover a multitude of sins.1 The sins thus hidden are such as cause error from the way of eternal life: St. John forbids the other interpretation when, as to the sin unto death, he says, I do not say that he shall pray for it.2 St. James makes very emphatic the probationary character of religion: he shall have judgment without mercy, that hath showed no mercy.3 The Apostle is speaking to Christian men, who may forget the royal law of charity; and what in their case must mean JUDGMENT WITHOUT MERCY!

1 James 5:19-20; 2 1 John 5:16; 3 James 2:13

(2.) St. Peter thus exhorts: give diligence to make your calling and election sure, for if ye do these things ye shall never fall,1 purely this is not language used of an impossible lapse. Satan may indeed by a violent interpretation be supposed to be self-deceived in seeking whom he may devour.2 But the Apostle warns all not to fall from their own steadfastness.3 1 2 Peter 1:10; 2 1 Peter 5:8; 3 2 Peter 3:17

(3.) St. Jude, in his short Epistle, speaks of backsliders like autumn, trees, without fruit, twice dead;1 and of men once Christians who had become sensual, having not the Spirit: these had

been in the spiritual family, else how could they make separations? The tenor of the Epistle is no other than a warning against eternal apostasy. Those who are preserved in Jesus Christ2 are bidden keep yourselves in the love of God.3 The doxology to Him that is able to keep you from falling4 is one that all confessions join in. These three KEEPINGS must be combined. The two former have the same Greek verb: those who are preserved in Christ must preserve themselves in God's love. The third varies the expression in two words: God is able to guard from falling, and He is ABLE to guard

Here is the threefold cord; all true Christians rejoice in the combination of its strands; but none should find in it more than the everlasting security which unites Almighty power and human fidelity 1 Jude 1:12; 2 Jude 1:1; Jude 1:12; 3 Jude 1:24; 4 Jude 1:25 (4.) St. Paul's view of redemption delights in the perfect stability of the eternal counsels

He evermore sees the consummation of the Divine designs, and all the heirs of salvation as already hid with Christ in God.1 But some of his words absolutely deny the indefectibility of grace. Besides leaving on record some other declarations which have been already referred to, he speaks of his rigor in the care of his own soul, lest . . . I myself should be rejected:2 no believer in an inalienable salvation would have adopted such language, certainly no inspired teacher of the truth would have spoken so unguardedly even in his deepest humility 1 Colossians 3:3; 2 1 Corinthians 9:27

(5.) The Epistle to the Hebrews contains passages which cannot accord with the necessary permanence of grace. Though their meaning may be exaggerated by those who make them deny the possibility of restoration after a certain measure and degree of fall, it is no exaggeration that they teach the possibility of an extinction of grace in such as had tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost.1 This, with the previous injunction, that no man fall after the same example of unbelief,2 the exhortation Cast not away therefore your confidence, which hath great recompense of reward,3 with the assurance that we are made partakers of Christ if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end,4 and other such passages, are thought by some simply to lay down a desperate and impossible hypothesis, or to refer only to an external profession without corresponding reality, or to speak of a lapse from a presumed state of grace, the hollowness of which is supposed to be detected. But on such principles of interpretation Scripture can be made to prove nothing, or rather can be made to prove anything 1 Hebrews 6:4-5; 2 Hebrews 6:11; 3 Hebrews 10:35; 4 Hebrews 3:14

(6.) The last organ of inspiration, whose writings perfect the New Testament, gives his clear testimony. St. John's First Epistle speaks of the possibility of being ashamed before Him at His coming,1 and that to little children, his affectionate term for true Christians

What he means by being ashamed a later text shows, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment:2 there will be no shame at the Judgment Day but in those who experience the dread calamity threatened by our Lord Himself again and again: of him also shall the Son of Man be ashamed.3 St. John's Gospel contains no teaching of his own, at least on this subject. In the Apocalypse also not John but his Lord speaks: and, although the threats against apostate Churches must not be pressed, the final words of the Redeemer are profoundly solemn: God shall take away his part from the tree of life:4 not refuse it to him, but take it away. Thus the Scriptures close with a testimony that is most decisive against the doctrine of an inevitable and unconditional

predestination to Final Perseverance 1 1 John 2:28; 2 1 John 4:17; 3 Mark 8:38; 4 Revelation 22:19

III. Although they thus speak, the opponents of this doctrine feel that there is a peculiarity in the present controversy which must always distinguish it from every other

1. The instinct of the true Christian loves the dogma that he is obliged to oppose: and the same instinct makes the true Christian who holds it act as if he held it not. Practically all who bear this character are one in the doctrine that Final Perseverance is a duty and a privilege. Those who deny that union with Christ, once effected, is inviolable—and deny it confidently because our Savior Himself says, If a man abide not in Me, he is cast forth as a branch1—nevertheless earnestly contend that such and so sacred a union is not easily and is not often finally dissolved. They admit that many lapses, and many grievous lapses, are consistent with that indwelling secret grace which is of all things the most tenacious of its hold on the heart of man. They know full well that there may be the residue of grace in the soul which seems almost sealed in reprobation; that the eye of mercy, never more quick to discern the secrets of the heart than when seeking for the traces of Good in the hidden, depths of man's nature, may behold life where the eye of man's judgment would see only death; and that Infinite Compassion may fan into flame the all but extinguished fire which none but Himself could discern. They feel the full meaning of the apologetic and almost retracting words which follow the plain warning against total apostasy: but, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak.2 1 John 15:6; 2 Hebrews 6:9

2. There is a sense in which the doctrine of Perseverance is common to all Confessions and must by all Christians be held. To the foreknowledge of the Omniscient not only is the mystical body sealed, but the salvation of every member of it is fixed. Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world:1 these words of St. James have a direct reference to the subject of our discussion; the God of Israel is visiting the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name.2 The number of the saved is before Him as if the whole process were over: an hundred and fifty and three were reckoned in the last symbolical fishing; the exact and finished number of the eternally sealed is now present to the Supreme Eye; and each individual of those who dispute over this doctrine is either saved or not saved in that future which is to God as the present 1 Acts 15:18; Acts 15:14; 2 John 21:11

3. But here we are on the brink of the unsearchable mystery of the union or unity between the Divine foreknowledge and the Divine predestination. What is now known to God must be to us nevertheless an issue not determined. Contemplating this truth as in the light of God's knowledge we may say that everyone finally saved must persevere. But in that light we must not contemplate it. God sees the end as an accomplished fact which man is working out as a contingency. We are all in PROBATION: each one of his descendants as certainly as Adam was. Personal ASSURANCE is given, or provision is made that it may be given, to each as the daily bread of life. And PERSEVERANCE is nothing but the holding that full assurance of hope unto the end.1

1 Hebrews 6:11

34. Vol 03 - Christian Ethics

Christian Ethics CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

ETHICS OF REDEMPTION THE CHRISTIAN LAWGIVER The Relation of Gospel Doctrine to Ethics;

Christian Ethics and Moral Philosophy; The Christian Law;

Liberty;

Love and Law;

Biblical Methods of Teaching CHRISTIAN ETHICS SYSTEMATIC

PERSONAL ETHICS of Conversion; of Intention; of the Conflict; of Service; of Devotion

RELATIVE ETHICS of Man and Man; of Family; of Commerce; of Politics; of the Church By the term Ethics of Redemption, or Christian Ethics, is signified the system of moral teaching which Christ the Redeemer has introduced in connection with His atoning work and the general economy of His grace. That system may be regarded, first, in its preeminence and peculiarity, as CHRISTIAN Ethics; and, secondly, in the formal arrangement of its principles, as Christian ETHICS This subject seems more appropriate here than in any independent position: it belongs to the Administration of Redemption, treating as it does of the new life for which the blessings of the New Covenant prepare the regenerate, and for which the regenerate are prepared. We are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.1 After dwelling so long on the estate of Christian privilege we pass naturally to the obligations connected with it. The ethics flow from the life. And in our course of doctrine it is obvious that the Morals of Christianity must be viewed only or mainly as they derive a new character from the Christian revelation. This principle must be remembered throughout the present Section In one sense it contracts the field of ethical teaching; but in another it immeasurably expands that field 1 Ephesians 2:10 THE ETHICS OF REDEMPTION

Jesus as Redeemer is the Supreme Legislator; and His teaching is the corrective complement of all Moral Philosophy. In the Evangelical scheme doctrine and ethics are closely connected: its revelations of truth are the foundation of its new life; its morals and its doctrine are everywhere interwoven; and, finally, the ethics of the Christian religion are the crown and consummation of its entire system CHRIST THE LAWGIVER Our Lord is Supreme Lawgiver, whether we regard His Person, His offices, or His manifested life. As thus supreme He is also the sole Teacher and Arbiter and the highest Example of morals

Christianity may in this department be regarded as the legislation of Christ: the NEW LAW given to the human race. The Savior both began and ended His ministry by asserting His absolute and unappealable authority: Whosoever heareth these sayings of Mine and doeth them!1 These words close the discourse with which the New Teacher commenced His lawgiving for all ages and for all

mankind; and it is most plain that He assumes this universal prerogative, to be the Master of all morals and duties. Similarly He finished His course by an equally large assertion of His place in the world's ethics. His disciples were to make disciples (or Christians) of all the nations . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you!2 Never did human lawgiver adopt this tone. Never did those whom God had commissioned thus speak. When Moses began his function, and had said I commanded you at that time all the things that ye should do, he added the charge against the people, ye would not go up, but rebelled against the commandments of the Lord your God.3 And his entire legislation is thus wound up: the people did as the Lord commanded Moses.4 This is in strong and most decisive contrast with the beginning and end of the new legislation 1 Matthew 7:24; 2 Matthew 28:20; 3 Deuteronomy 1:18; Deuteronomy 1:26; 4 Deuteronomy 34:9

I. It is important to remember that the Legislator in the new economy is the Lord Jesus in His Divine-human Mediatorial Person, both God and man in one

1. The Divinity of the Christian Lawgiver is the first postulate and glorious distinction of Christianity as the perfect economy. The Creator alone can give law to His creatures: there is One Lawgiver,1 and there can be no second: nomodidaskalos many but only one nomothetees in all the Scripture. Moses is not so called: he gave not that law from heaven, but was faithful in all his house, as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after.2 But Christ as a Son over His own house prescribes its laws with Divine authority. In the Sermon on the Mount He distinguishes Himself, not only from the Rabbinical expositors of Moses, but from Moses himself, by His oftrecurring 'Ego de: But I SAY UNTO YOU!3 And we hear in this, as in all His words, the Voice of the Son of God uttering His own eternal will 1 James 4:12; 2 Hebrews 3:5-6; 3 Matthew 5:1-48

2. The perfect manhood of Jesus, however, was and is the organ of this legislation. In the indivisible unity of His Person He enacts His laws amidst human conditions, and condescends to appear as the highest of human lawgivers. He accepts and even responds to the words of Nicodemus, We know that Thou art a teacher come from God.1 But never in the New Testament are we permitted for one moment to listen to Him as only the supreme embodiment of merely human wisdom. God was with Him, we may infer with the Jewish Rabbi; but we must take the testimony of the Officers in a sense beyond their meaning, Never man spake like this Man!2 for God was not only with Him but IN HIM 1 John 3:2; 2 John 7:46

3. Our Lord proclaims His will not as Divine simply, nor as simply human: never, in plain terms, I am the Lord thy God! but never, I speak as a man. He speaks as the Son of Man which is in heaven:1 as the new Teacher He uttered these words to Nicodemus

Before the Incarnation it was God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers in the prophets.2 The Holy Trinity was in the legislation of Paradise and Sinai and of the whole moral world: but under many limitations —both as to Himself and as to the objects of His moral government—which the Gospel has removed

God hath now spoken to us IN His SON, GOD-MAN, the Divine-human Representative of universal law binding on all creatures upon earth 1 John 3:13; 2 Hebrews 1:1

II. The Redeemer's legislation is bound up with His office as the Christ: this has been already exhibited under the Mediatorial Ministry, but may with propriety be touched on again under another and more limited aspect

1. In the threefold unity of His work He is the Prophet, explaining all law, whether in its transitory or in its eternal forms; and changing the law of commandments contained in ordinances1 into the perfect law of liberty.2 He is also the Priest—not the High Priest, there is but One—who has expiated sin against the law, and obtained the Spirit for a new obedience. As King He is in heaven what as Prophet He was upon earth; He is the Legislator crowned in His incarnate Person; the One Lawgiver Who is able to save and to destroy;3 the Judge who will confirm the eternal sanctions of the law which He has given 1 Ephesians 2:15; 2 James 1:25; 3 Jas. 6:12

2. Hence His offices are really two. His priestly function has reference to the broken law, broken long before Moses threw down the tables. His whole life and history is one satisfaction to the Divine will: honoring it by a full obedience; and then, defying its inquisition for Himself, paying the penalty of our violation. His other work is that of teaching and ruling in one: guiding the redeemed and sanctified to perfection of righteousness. Thus on these two offices hangs the whole Christian system as it is redemption from sin and discipline unto holiness. We are bidden in the Epistle to the Hebrews to consider the Apostle and High Priest of our confession, even Jesus;1 in His perfect administration the Moses and the Aaron of the new economy united. As the Apostle from God He announces all the Divine-will, and as High Priest from man He makes provision for our obedience: not the one without the other

1 Hebrews 3:1

3. But we may reduce all to unity. In a certain sense our Lord came from heaven to earth only as our Master and Lord;1 having virtually redeemed us before we existed, and created us anew before we were created. This alone does justice to the Redeemer's dignity as the Restorer of all things. He was, and is, and ever will be the only Moral Ruler of man: of other Worlds than ours, but also of ours; and of ours in an economy of law strangely modified by grace. In this view His atonement is part of His legislation; He appointed a task of redeeming expiation for Himself, and, as Lawgiver, through the law died to the law. Here is the supreme unity of all His offices: to this end Christ both died and revived, that He might be Lord both of the dead and living.2 The highest reach of our contemplation regards Him as the moral Governor of mankind Who has become one with our race to restore us to our obedience and union with God. This unity reigns throughout the New Testament Our Lord gives His new law before He even speaks of His coming death; He refers to His atonement as the necessary ground of our new sanctification to obedience, and, having died for us, He still continues to be OUR Master and Lord. And to this one end and supreme unity of His whole work give all His Apostles witness 1 John 13:13; 2 Romans 14:9

III. In His mediatorial history or official career the Christian Lawgiver blended in a most mysterious and affecting manner the Divine dignity of His Person and the Messianic humiliation. He learned the obedience that He taught; He exercised supreme ethical authority even while learning it; and He presented Himself, uniting the two, as the perfect Example of His own precepts. Here, as everywhere, we find the unsearchable unity of His two natures in one personal agency investing the whole subject

1. Our Lord learned obedience. In the mystery of His Person he united the Supreme Lawgiver above responsibility and the human subject responsible for obedience. During His humbled estate He began, continued, and ended with the latter: from 1 must!1 in the Temple of His early consecration, and My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me!2 of His mid career, down to 1 have finished the work!3 under the cross 1 Luke 2:49; 2 John 4:34; 3 John 17:4

(1.) Here there are some qualifications. The first is that the Savior learned the obedience1—His proper Messianic obedience not so much in doing as in suffering—to a law of moral obligation His own and unshared. And, however hard it may be to our reason, neither of that truth nor of its consequences must we be afraid. Before He gave us a new commandment He had a new one in a much higher sense given to Himself. Again His obedience was necessary. The unity of His Personality shielded Him from the possibility of sinning even as His miraculous conception introduced Him sinless into the world. Christ is not divided, cannot be divided, against Himself. Sin wrapped Him round as a garment; but never entered His soul save in its vicarious bitterness. On the cross His seamless robe was, as it were, in the hands of His enemies, but there lay the perfection of the obedience to which the Incarnate was disciplined. He was taught as a Son the mystery of unfathomable suffering for sin in us, and of equally unfathomable suffering through temptation to impossible sin. He was not in probation. He learned the things of a man, ta tou anthroopou: the things of God, ta tou Theou, He never learned. Nor did He acquire dominion over the universal kingdom of ethics by having been a Sojourner for a night among them. He brought down a Divine power which gave them in Him a new perfection. His supreme government in the ethical domain was not founded on His submission to human duty

1 Hebrews 5:8

(2.) Yet the Incarnate, though a Son, learned obedience: He proved and exhibited the discharge of DUTY in all departments of life, and in this sense underwent the experience of human obligations. As a Son, as an Israelite, as a subject of Rome, as a Rabbi surrounded by disciples, as a public Instructor or Minister of the circumcision, as a member of the human commonwealth, He manifested submission to every authority. He practiced obedience as an impeccable human being would practice it, or as God Himself might obey His own ordinances. This obedience was, however, VIRTUE in the meaning which it has received in Christian Ethics. It is indeed hard for us to conceive the virtue of passive endurance unallied with the active suppression of a reluctant will. It is hard to understand what virtue there can be in a submission which springs from the necessity of a will eternally one with the Divine will. But, hard as it is, it is not impossible. And only on this principle can we accept the obedience of the Incarnate Son. The sublimest holiness is the recoil from impossible wrong. Divine hatred of sin, sorrow for sinners, and endurance of the penalty of transgression, became incarnate in Jesus. The sympathy which the Creator had felt with His erring creature learned its mystery over again in the Redeemer The New Teacher showed, beforehand, the secret of His own legislation: love is the fulfilling of the law.1 In His devotion to God and charity for man—in that love which in a sense unparalleled was in Him teteleiomenoo—He kept all the commandments: both those which were given to Him alone and strained His human endurance to the utmost, and those which He obeyed as it were unconsciously and of necessity, finding in obedience the meat and drink of life. As He took not our individual sins upon His soul for expiation, but rather our sin in its fullness and essence; so He kept and honored not so much laws as the law. Some individual laws had nothing in Him, and He never did nor ever could learn them; but He

nevertheless honored all law generally in the principle of the perfect obedience of LOVE TO GOD AND MAN

1 Romans 13:10

(3.) Our Lord exercised Divine authority at the same time that He underwent the Mediatorial discipline which His redeeming work required. The prerogative of His Godhead could not be suspended, though it might be veiled. It was by His own Divine will that He became subordinate. And, throughout His submission, there was occasionally given the most abundant proof, both of act and word, that the Supreme Lawgiver was present in Him, and that Jesus Himself Who spoke was no other than He. During His humiliation there was a veil untaken away from the face of the Greater than Moses. He does not say as yet: Behold, I make all things new!1 although He brings new commandments and new institutions. He appeals to the ancient legislation and them of old time,2 to the authority of Scripture which cannot be broken,3 and to God as the Judge of all and the ultimate appeal. But His constant reserve and general assumption of a secondary place was only a veil. The valley of His humiliation is crowned by three Mountains where the Lawgiver receives honor and glory: partly as the fruit of His submission, but still more as the revelation of what He had with God before the world was. On the first, that of the Beatitudes, He asserts His supreme, that is His Divine, authority without one single allusion to any Greater than Himself. On the second, that of the Transfiguration, His claims are confirmed by the voice of God. And, on the third, the Mountain in Galilee, after His atoning death, His words unite the subordinate and the supreme authority: the subordinate, all power is given unto Me; the supreme, Lo, I am with you alway!4 If in the valley we hear the voice of a man, on these mountains we hear the voice of God. But the voices are the same. After the Ascension there is no longer any concealment, The Pentecost was the festival and glorification of the New Law. Our Lord now speaketh from heaven;5 and from heaven, by common consent, none can speak but God. It was in fact the same Voice that gave the legislation of Sinai that then shook the earth. After being for a season lowered to human accents, it now speaks through the Spirit. Thus throughout the whole Bible there is but One Voice of moral authority. In all the New Testament, the will of God and the will of Christ are one; and we may lawfully, when we hear our Master say, He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father, carry on His words to this further meaning: He that hath heard Me hath heard the Father.6 1 Revelation 21:5; 2 Matthew 5:21; 3 John 10:35; 4 Matthew 28:18; Matthew 28:20; 5 Hebrews 12:23; 6 John 16:9

2. The Lord gave a Divine-human and perfect example: the only Legislator who ever did or ever could make His own life His code of laws. He began His ministry by a perfect summary of all human duty, But I say unto you;1 He ended by declaring, I have given you an example.2 But here again the mystery of the twofold nature of the One Person of the Lawgiver suggests qualifications which cannot be too deeply pondered, or too habitually borne in mind. It is too often forgotten 1 Matthew 5:1-48; 2 John 13:15

(1.) His example was necessarily PERFECT. This has been often questioned: the character of Jesus, as the Ideal of His own laws, has been impeached. By some its peerless perfection has been denied, by some it has been disparaged in comparison with that of other teachers, and even with that of His own disciples. But many of the reproaches cast upon it by the eyes that seeing see not are the reproaches equally of the ancient Jehovah The God of the Old Testament wears the

same moral attributes as Jesus in the New. The tones of His wrath are precisely in the same strain as we hear in the old economy; and they are mingled with the same gentleness and mercy. His anger is Divine anger; and His sternness is the same—neither more nor less rigorous—as that of the Lawgiver Who appointed Moses in all his house. But it is an offence to the censors of Jesus that He failed in the opposite sentiment: that He shrank from the endurance which He demanded of His followers, and failed, where He required them to succeed, in sovereign contempt of suffering and death. But His meekness and recoil from woe were the tribute of perfect purity to suffering unknown, and the expression of His HORROR MORTIS, or affright at death, was really His Divine-human affright at sin or HORROR PECCATI. It was because He was more than man that in meeting the infinite consequence of sin He seemed less than perfect man. None, however, who deny the mystery of the Atonement can feel the force of this. Yet even they may be challenged to prove that there was in the suffering Jesus less than the perfection of human patience and magnanimity. Even to them the For this cause came I unto this hour1ought to explain and condone the Let this cup pass from Me!2Reverence forbids our carrying this apology further, Suffice that no clear eye and no pure heart can be in the presence of the Redeemer without yielding to the conviction that He taught no virtue which He did not exemplify; so far, that is, as a Sinless Being, who had never known nor could ever know sin, might be its exemplar 1 John 12:27; 2 Matthew 27:39

(2.) Yet, as these last words suggest, His was not in all respects a perfect EXAMPLE. His Divine-human excellence is in some sense too high, we cannot attain unto it. Therefore neither does the Lord, nor do His Apostles after Him, exhibit His life as at all points the directory of ours. In some details of duty He could not set us a pattern: for them we must go to men subject to like passions as we are.1He became the Author of eternal salvation,2ot to those who copy Him in the process—He never passed through the process—but to all them that obey Him. He gives the ideal and the sum of the blessed result: the way to it we know, and He is Himself the way, but we do not see the print of His footsteps on the path from the far country back again to holiness. Whenever His example is spoken of, it is in affecting connection with humility, patience, self-sacrifice for others, and utter abandonment of the world. But He did not reach those heavenly affections as we must reach them. They were His Divine condescension brought down from above, and translated into human forms: in us they are the hard won triumphs of His Spirit overcoming their opposites. His virtue brought Him from heaven to earth; ours must carry us from earth to heaven. We must imitate His great submission; but none of us can ever utter His vicarious cry, My God, My God, WHY HAST THOU FORSAKEN ME ?3 For He, unlike us, had never FORSAKEN GOD 1 James 5:17; 2 Hebrews 5:9; 3 Matthew 27:46

3. Hence, to sum up, the principle of our DUTY is His obedience in love; the strength of our VIRTUE is His Spirit; and the SUMMUM BONUM of our blessedness is His Peace. In Him we see the whole Law reflected in its highest purity; by His character we interpret it, and all our obedience is the silent imitation of Himself. His excellence is Divine and human: to be adored and imitated. As God He commands, and as Man shows us how to obey. The Lawgiver gives us both the Pattern and the strength to copy THE GOSPEL AND ETHICS

Christianity is a DOCTRINE ACCORDING TO GODLINESS.1 Christian morals are as such founded on specific Christian truth; they are taught in alliance with it; and are exhibited as the end of all its teaching

1 1 Timothy 6:3 This might seem to be the place for considering the relation of Christian Ethics to Moral Philosophy. But we must first establish the exclusive principles of these new ethics as inseparably connected with the revelation of Jesus. This is only a meet tribute to the preeminence of the Gospel, which has learnt nothing from the philosophy of this world that it does not hold independently of all earthly philosophy

I. Reserving for the next Section any remarks upon the general fundamental principles of morals, we may say that the prominent doctrines first taught or fully brought to light in the Christian Revelation are the foundation of Christian Ethics. There are three great underlying truths which may be said to be at the basis of all other foundations: the Fall, or from what; the Redemption, through what; the Future, unto what; the moral discipline of Christ aims to raise mankind. These doctrines themselves are treated elsewhere. It is needful here only to indicate their essential relation to ethics

1. The Fall with its concomitant doctrine of Original Sin vitally and throughout affects Christian Morals as a system. Christianity alone reveals what was the original estate of mankind; how a perfect moral condition was lost through the misuse of freedom; what is the place freewill still holds in the formation of character; how the ethical good remaining in the elements of humanity is to be accounted for; and for what a high destiny man was created and is still reserved. It shows how entirely his nature is depraved as to the attainment of good: teaching that there is in every mortal a bias to evil irresistible save through grace; and that it is his destiny, merely as man, freely to work out that evil which has become the necessity of his freewill. It lays the foundation of its ethics amidst the ruins of our fallen dignity: raising a superstructure which is at once a new creation and a reconstruction, building its new temple out of the fragments of the old. It deals with the world as a deeply lapsed but not utterly ruined world; as profoundly corrupted but not entirely dissolved. And it deals with every man as having in himself, notwithstanding his heritage from Adam, the elements of a moral nature that may be retrieved. But not retrieved through any effort of its own: the Christian legislation begins by requiring utter self-renunciation, self-distrust, or self-despair. It never allows the Fall to be forgotten, amidst all the triumphs of grace

2. Redemption—objective, wrought FOR us by Christ; subjective, wrought IN us by the Holy Ghost—does not so much follow as accompany the Fall in its relation to the ethics of Christianity

(1.) The preliminary grace which we regard as the firstfruits of the Redeemer's intervention for the race explains the secret desire of man to be restored; and thus lights up the whole sphere of ethics. It is that redemption before Redemption which interprets the universal condemnation of evil and approval of good recorded in the judicial court of human nature itself: so unerringly, indeed, that the word Conscience, strictly speaking the human consciousness of moral character, has been made generally to signify the human moral faculty. It is this to which the Christian Lawgiver, and those who follow His teaching, always appeal. It must never be forgotten throughout our study of the Evangelical legislation. It gives consistency to the whole sum of its moral teaching, and makes morals possible to man

(2.) The forgiveness it seals on the conscience—which imparts to the pardoned the double consciousness, of sin on the one hand as a fact, and of guiltlessness as an imputation on the other—takes away the barrier to moral endeavor, arid gives it its strongest incentive. There is unspeakable strength in the thought of having paid the penalty once for all in a Substitute who

belongs to the race and to each member of it who claims Him. Vain is all teaching of morality without a preliminary forgiveness: vain the Benedictions on the Mount unless in the anticipation of an Atonement which should first have silenced the Woes in the City

(3.) Redemption from the curse of the law is also deliverance from the power of evil through.the supply to the secret springs of human action of the power of an indwelling God. It renders all things possible. As forgiveness, entire and constant, removes the greatest impediment to moral effort—making guilt as if it were not—so the Spirit of regeneration literally throws open to human aspiration and attainment the whole compass of ethical perfection. Nothing is impossible to one who is forgiven and renewed

Moreover, it is not too much to say that redemption as an internal experience imparts a specific character to all Christian ethics. The sense of pardon gives birth to a new order of ethical emotions and obligations, and the new life in Christ is the sphere of a new order of ethical duties and attainments and experiences of which we need not now speak more particularly

3. Christianity has brought to light the future life, with its powers and terrors and hopes, and incorporated that also into the foundation of its ethics

(1.) This gives the morals of human life their probationary character; responsibility derives from it a new meaning; time becomes inestimably precious in relation to eternity; and every act, and word, and thought has a new importance through its bearing on a fixed and eternal condition. It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment!1 This was a new voice in the sphere of the world's ethical teaching: interpreting the instinct of universal conscience; lighting up the dimmer revelations of the Old Testament; and making the powers of the world to come, what they had never been so fully before, the moving forces of the world that now is, by bringing life and immortality to light.2 1 Hebrews 9:27; 2 2 Timothy 1:10

(2.) It furnishes the final and deepest sanctions of moral law. SANCTION is the guard thrown around a command or duty to enforce its performance: the sanction of the duty not done is the punishment of the person who fails. The only sanction of law is the displeasure of God: but that displeasure in its fullest expression is now by this doctrine, as ethical, postponed to the Great Day. The preliminary tokens of it in this world are but the beginnings of wrath: the judgment is indeed begun, and the word Eternal has entered into time; but Christianity makes the future world, with its judgment at the threshold, the issue of all its moral teaching. The penalty of eternal separation from God is the great ethical argument: Christian probation is a decision of the question whether the original doom shall be finally reversed or rendered eternal. Accordingly this gives its true character to the sin from which men are to be saved: without this its ethics are an unreality. It is ETERNAL SIN1 in its possibilities. There is nothing against which the sentiment or sentimentality of many thinkers so persistently rebels as this. Some so recoil as to reject the Christianity which is based upon it, while others find their refuge in recasting the doctrine of eternal retribution. To them Sin is merely a Flood of misery, and Christ only our Noah or Comforter Who will hereafter either make all men forget their sorrows in a universal restoration or put out of existence those whom He cannot restore

1 Mark 3:29

(3.) The future is also the goal of creaturely perfection; that Summum Bonum, or final blessedness of the soul to which the ethics of Christianity perpetually point the aspiration of its disciples: not only as the consummate fruition of the results of well doing but as the vision of God Himself. In a lower sense the former may be said to be the final ethical argument: My reward is with Me!1 But the highest reward is the joy of thy Lord.2 1 Revelation 22:12; 2 Matthew 25:21

4. All this being true, we may justly speak of Redemptional Ethics. The Christian Religion knows no other. The need or problem, the method and process, the stimulant and end of all ethics are in that one truth, that we are a race delivered by the Hand of a Mediator. Redemption is the central idea: the Fall flanks it on one side, Eternity on the other. All these elements are summed up in St Paul's last ethical compendium, which perhaps contains the largest and most comprehensive statement of the three fundamental principles of Evangelical morality, with the atoning work in the middle. The grace of redemption hath appeared, saving to all men. It imparts forgiveness as grace, and teacheth, or disciplineth to all that morality which is a realization of the redeeming purpose. And the issue of all is the blessed hope and glorious appearing of the Great God and our Savior Jesus Christ Who gave Himself for us.1

1 Titus 2:11-14 II. The Christian doctrine and Christian ethics are interwoven

1. We have not here two departments in the theology of Scripture. From Genesis to Revelation, from Sinai to Pentecost, there is no difference between the methods of exhibiting what man must believe and what he must practice. As in natural religion, and its almost illegible characters, conscience is at once the teaching that God is and that we are responsible to Him; so in the supernatural revelation of the Bible doctrine and duty are bound up together in their relation to the Supreme, 2. Every doctrine however has its ethical side: all truth returns in duty to Him who gave it. This may be illustrated by reference to the individual subjects that make up the sum of dogmatic theology. God is a Person and man is a person: all their common relations must be ethical. The Divine perfections are not objects of contemplation simply: so viewed they would only exhaust the mind; in ethics they mightily strengthen it, and each special attribute infers its corresponding obligation. The Trinity presides over a rich domain of ethics that have to do with the economical relations of each sacred Person to the Triune One and to every believer. The Mediatorial Work of Christ is a congregation of revealed truths, each of which, whether referring to Himself or His work, has its moral bearing The Life was the Light of men.1 The appropriation of personal salvation introduces a series of teachings which are as much ethical as dogmatic. There is a doctrine and a practice of repentance: the doctrine of Divine conviction, the practice of confession and amendment. The influence of grace is formulated as a dogma; the activity of man is ethical. Justification by faith is a doctrine: righteousness its ethics. Sanctification is a doctrine off the Spirit's purifying consecration unto holiness: the processes of renewal unto perfection are ethical. The subject of the Church has its infinite variety of moral bearings. So also the new revelations of Christian Eschatology. Death as doctrine has its ethics of preparation. So also the Eternal Realities, and the Restoration of Christ which precedes them. But all this will appear more fully in the sequel. It may be said that no doctrine is ever taught without reference to a corresponding human duty; nor is any duty taught for which a doctrinal reason is not given. There is the utmost parsimony in the teaching: the utmost reasonableness in the requirements. We can always give a reason of our hope in the doctrine; and of our duty in the ethics

1 John 1:4 III. Ethics are the crown and consummation of all teaching

1. It may be said generally that the manifold lines of revelation meet in the restoration of the Divine image in man. This is their glorious vanishing point. The various teaching of which the Fall is the centre explains the violation or loss of that image; all that is taught concerning redemption is one diversified account of the means of its renewal; and the revelations of eternity converge to its restored and perfect reflection. All the doctrine of the Bible is summed up in one word: God has become man that man might become one with God again

2. We find a constant disparagement of mere knowledge as such: thus hee gnoosis fusioi hee de agapee oikodomei: knowledge puffeth up, but charity buildeth up.1 There is, however, a knowledge spoken of in Scripture which is both doctrinal and ethical. The word ceases to be only Greek, it takes a Hebrew meaning, and becomes more than mere intellectual science. It is not gnoosis but epignoosin: according to that great prayer, that ye might be filled with the knowledge of His will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding.2 1 1 Corinthians 8:1; 2 Colossians 1:9

3. Hence theology is after all and in its highest form a perfect system of Ethics. In every age, and in every aspect of it, this has been its aim. Outside of revelation PHILOSOPHY was the unity of what doctrine and duty it had to teach: it was the RELIGION of the Old World, which, however ardently it aspired to unfold the grounds of morality, had but a scanty basis of theological dogma whereon to erect its teachings. When we speak of the CHRISTIAN RELIGION as well as of the CHRISTIAN FAITH, we make no real distinction; for, though the latter term belongs rather to the system of what is believed, and the former to the worship and practice resulting, both alike combine the confession and the life of the professors of Christianity

4. The perpetual remembrance of the supremacy of Ethics tends to save theological study from its hardness and barrenness. It limits the range of that part of it which is speculative, and sheds a peculiar grace on all the residue. But it must not be forgotten that, while Ethics are the consummation of theological science, the underlying doctrines on which they rest are essential to their integrity. They degenerate, unless these are always remembered, into a subjective and sentimental reflection of human phantasies, varying with the endless variations of opinion as to man’s natural history. The moral system which is not based on a sure substratum of truth is a mere reconstruction of the broken fragments of our fallen nature, without an architect or a plan CHRISTIAN ETHICS AND MORAL PHILOSOPHY

What Natural Theology is to the theology of supernatural revelation, Moral Philosophy is to Christian Ethics. They agree as to some of the main fundamentals of ethical science, but afterwards widely diverge: the Christian system of morals supplying what is essentially lacking in all moral teaching that is independent of its guidance

It has been sufficiently shown that the morals of Christianity should be introduced into every system of dogmatic theology; and that as a distinct department, though much that belongs to redemptional ethics is anticipated in the State of Salvation. Of course there is a large region of ethical science that is only indirectly concerned with theology, the study of which leads us into the wide region of Moral Philosophy proper. This science has occupied the best thought of mankind; and the history of its development, both as apart from Christianity and as connected with it, is deeply instructive. Into that history we need not now enter. The first principles of our religion forbid

us to regard Moral Philosophy as the great science of which ours is only a branch. But, if revealed theology is supreme, then Moral Philosophy loses much of its independent meaning; for, what it only seeks and speculates about, the infallible record has given us

I. Christian Moral Philosophy—for we may adopt this compromise—accepts and enlarges, or rather corrects, the name and general definition of ethical science

1. The terms Ethics and Morals are scarcely to be distinguished. Ethics, from othos or ethos, has relation to the home, seat, posture, habit, or internal character of the soul; Morals, from mos, or custom, rather to the outward manifestation of that internal character. Both words have been too much limited to the region of the outer life. In themselves they are vague, and show their earthly origin. The Christian revelation does not reject them; but they are not found in its early documents, save in the eethee chreesta1 of the quotation from Menander. The terms of the New-Testament which are strictly answerable to these are only two: GODLINESS, as a habit of soul like that of God; HOLINESS, as a habit of soul sanctified from sin. Into these two words, at least, all others rise, as will be hereafter seen 1 1 Corinthians 15:33 2. But every definition of the science must submit to Christian censure and correction

Aristotle termed it hee peri ta anthropina philosophia, THE PHILOSOPHY OF HUMAN INTERESTS, which the Old Testament signifies by THE WHOLE OF MAN, and the New Testament elevates into ta ton theou, MY FATHER'S BUSINESS,1 or THE WILL OF GOD.2 In all ages that clear distinction has been made between natural and moral science, or Physics and Ethics, which Kant has thus expressed: "Physics, the science of the laws of nature; Ethics, the science of the laws of freedom." This definition, so utterly opposed to modern Positive Philosophy— which lays man's acts under the dominion of the same necessity that reigns over matter, though in a more refined form—is profoundly Christian, But it omits what is essential to the new and supreme system, that the laws of freedom are under the government of the Holy Spirit. Bentham is the representative of a very different principle. He terms it " the art of directing the actions of men in such a manner as to produce the greatest happiness:" this is the Utilitarian view, and, in the light of our religion, imperfect and wrong. The more Christian Paley is not much better: "The science which teaches men their duty and the reasons of it." This is inadequate in all respects; though it is difficult to detect the secret of its superficiality. But this will be seen when it is compared with Neander's definition: "Moral Philosophy is concerned with the development of the laws for human conduct; Christian Ethics derives these laws from the essence of Christianity."

1 Luke 2:49; 2 Mark 3:35

II. The fundamental principles of Moral Philosophy as independent of revelation are accepted and confirmed by Christianity; which, however, modifies and perfects some of those principles

1. The words expressing moral ideas are most of them retained in their usual meaning: that which has been stamped on them by the consent of mankind. The general vocabulary is the same: for instance, conscience, obligation, or the ought and the must, law, right, good and evil, sin, judgment, reward, punishment are found with the same application in the Scriptures as outside of them. Some, however, of these words are elevated, as we shall see, into a higher meaning by the interpretation of the Spirit of liberty and love; while there are many terms of great ethical significance which are the pure mintage of Christian Ethics: such as love, purity, sanctification,

peace, holiness, blessedness, godliness. A large and sacred and among us most familiar branch of ethical nomenclature owe s its origin to the Founder of Christianity and the Apostles whom He instructed

2. The theories which have been and are current concerning the primary grounds and obligations of morality are not even alluded to in the Holy Scriptures. They never discuss what makes good to be good and evil to be evil, right to be right and wrong to be wrong: all such discussions are superseded and swallowed up in the testimony that none is good save One, that is God,1 and that the nature of God as the ground of obligation is His will: I come to do Thy will, 0 God,2 The moralists of the Bible know no eternal ground of obligation outside of or behind or independent of the Supreme. Meanwhile the interminable discussion continues. Some place it in the nature of God or in His will, some in the vague abstraction called the fitness of things; some reduce it to the subjective moral sense in man, some to the law of universal benevolence and the value of happiness; while some appeal to the idea of what is right, thus begging the question; and, others, lastly, find it in the intrinsic goodness of virtue. Christian thinkers join in the discussion, and give their support by terms to every theory; but the deepest among them will admit that to the moral agent the ground of obligation is the Divine will, while to man as a creature the only ground is the Divine nature of which his own is an image or reflection As to the materialist theories that make conscience and right and good only inventions of men’s hopes and fears and calculations, like God Himself, and all ethics, in their obligation and their loveliness, only the result of unnumbered ages of social evolution, Christianity reasons not of them but beholds them and goes on its way 1 Luke 18:19; 2 Hebrews 10:9

3. Moral Philosophy has, in later times especially, distinguished between DUTY, VIRTUE, and the SUMMUM BONUM, as regulating the processes of ethics. These terms are found in Christian ethical systems; but so much are they changed by their regeneration in Christianity that they cease to be available for their old service. They are raised into the unity of Holiness to the Lord:1 a conception known only to supernatural religion. This sacred phrase, which carries us into the inmost sanctuary of the new temple, contains the three terms: the Virtue is in the HOLINESS, which is severe separation from evil; the Duty is in TO THE LORD; and the Summum Bonum is the union with Divinity which is implied The Chief Good of man is his blessedness in the fellowship of God: the term happiness is no longer supreme. Christ hath shown man what is good. DUTY is transfigured by its connection with redemption: ye are not your own.2 It finds its standard in Jesus; its sphere in His kingdom; and its one object in the Redeeming Triune God. And obligation is translated into love which is VIRTUE; love is the bond of perfectness,3 in the following of the Lord and the reflection of His most holy image. Love is the secret and the unity of the three 1 Zechariah 14:20; 2 1 Corinthians 6:19-20; 3 Colossians 3:14

4. Christianity, in defining the moral system founded on the New Testament, not only is willing to accept the wide extension given to the science by Moral Philosophy, but even enlarges in its turn upon that. Aristotle has been followed by most systematisers who have made it include Social Economics, Jurisprudence, and Politics: in fact, the whole sum and complex of human relations. Modern thinkers and moralists omit from it the branches that concern merely the activity of man and the education of his sense of the beautiful, or AESTHETICS. But they directly include, as the New Testament indirectly does, all the rest: with the addition of our relation to the Christian Church and the Future State. It has been seen already that there is a sense in which Christianity makes all

its teaching on every subject whatever, throughout the whole economy of truth, doctrine which is ACCORDING TO GODLINESS.1 Its relation to God, determines the value of all knowledge

1 1 Timothy 6:3

III. Christian Ethics, while it accepts and supplements the speculative teaching of Moral Philosophy on some most important subjects, condemns many of its speculations on others

1. It assumes willingly this favorite phrase, MORAL PHILOSOPHY, but on the condition that its leading term be elevated into a higher meaning. Its philosophia, or Philosophy goes not merely seek after and love wisdom or truth, but has found it. Nor does it reject the term DEONTOLOGY rightly understood: the science of what SHOULD BE it teaches, but as the science also of what may be and in Christ is attainable and attained, practicable and practiced. Truth in Jesus is positive and absolute; and philosophy, in its elder limited meaning, is now the same anachronism that mere natural theology is. The Philosophia moralis of Cicero and Seneca was speculative inquiry: the philosophy of the ancient world, East and West, was deeply religious, but only as feeling after the Supreme. The school of seekers into the midst of which St. Paul entered was gathered round an altar to the Unknown God, But the Gospel has declared the true God of holiness to our dogmatic theology and the true holiness of God to our ethical: both in one and both in perfection

2. Christianity, like all sound Moral Philosophy, excludes speculation as to the existence of that substratum of all ethics, the human soul. There is a philosophical system, falsely and most unworthily so called, which denies the personality and separate existence of the ethical subject. Its watchword is that all substance is one. Two schools diverge from this position: one which makes the universe itself and all the universe God, Pantheism; and another which makes all the universe only matter. In the former morals are lost, as being only the capricious and transitory developments of God’s own acts, which do not mar His character only because they are passing phenomena on the way to eternal good. In the latter—which gives the present age the very dregs of philosophy—man is supposed to have slowly invented as well the ground as the form and the sanction of what he calls his morals. It may seem unjust to the Pantheism of Spinoza to link it with Materialism. But, however unjust to the founder of modern Pantheism it may be, it is no injustice to the system itself, which logically can have no morals because it leaves no room for responsibility. In fact, neither Pantheism nor Materialism—both victims of the restless pursuit of an unattainable Unity—can have any place for a Moral Philosophy; nor can Moral Philosophy find any place for them

3. Christianity, in its philosophy of morals, accepts the constitution of human nature as the regulator of ethical inquiry: hut it has its own clear teaching as it regards the genesis and development and tendency of that nature. It does not leave it matter of speculation whether man is rising by the law of secular evolution to perfection or is recovering a lost estate. Adopting or rather enforcing the latter theory, it guards its ethical science against the danger of reasoning too much from the elements of what is called human nature, viewed as apart from the Fall

4. Its doctrine of Mediation does not alter the foundations of virtue, hut introduces a God whose justice and mercy combine in a mystery of which Moral Philosophy knows nothing. Pardon assured and sealed gives birth, as we have seen, to a new department of obligations and graces.

So also does regeneration and an indwelling Spirit. A new order of words is introduced— grace, graces, privileges, sanctification, union with Christ, —all unknown to human morals. In fact, it is here that Moral Philosophy and Christian Ethics separate at least, if they do not become estranged towards each other. Moral Philosophy as such takes human nature as it is, and studies it apart from the secret history of the Fall: it makes the best use of what it finds, without over-curiously investigating how its subject became what he is. It also knows nothing of the mystery of expiation: not denying it, neither does it appeal to it. Eight must he vindicated, and wrong must he punished; and, according to its teaching, as such, and supposing it not to borrow from the Gospel, the Divine justice and human frailty must come to terms through some compromise that it cannot explain

5. The Future in Moral Philosophy as such is either omitted, or limited to human perfectibility in the present world, or introduced as a factor of probability only into Ethics. The Christian Future sheds its light on every region, glorifies every word, and gives unity to the whole by revealing an end and consummation of which mere human systems know nothing. Nothing certainly, that is: almost every system of morals has indeed introduced the future as an element of probability. Christianity uses this factor as absolute truth; and this has always assured to it its power and pre-eminence over every other teaching whatever

IV. Finally, it may be observed that a sound system of Christian Ethics lays the best and only sure foundation of a Moral Philosophy worthy of the name. Some of the noblest treatises on the subject have been written by professors of the Christian Faith, who have expounded the whole range of ethical questions on the principles of the New Testament

1. There is a sense indeed in which Christianity may be boldly said to have originated moral science as such: it has created a doctrinal system as its basis, and given ethics a distinct and definite character which it had not before. In every system which has appeared apart from the New Law there has been a marked absence of some of the first conditions of science properly so called. All was tentative, empirical, and uncertain

Ancient philosophy never pretended to include in its discussion of Ethics more than a very limited range of obligations. Why there was any obligation at all it could never clearly define. It was indeed exceedingly elaborate in its treatment of certain cardinal vices and virtues; but there its philosophy ended. The Christian teaching may lay claim to be in the deepest sense a Moral Philosophy: it gives a full account of the moral nature of man; it establishes the grounds of ethical obligation; it exhibits the sanctions of law; it gives a most comprehensive legislation, adapted to every variety of human estate; it provides for the appeasing of conscience, and the renewal of the soul; it sets perfection before the hope of all; and it shows to what that perfection finally leads. The fundamental revelation on which all this is based may indeed be rejected; and then of course the whole superstructure may be thought to fall. But it still remains that there is no other to take its place; and that it is the only philosophy of ethics that challenges the judgment of man and appeals to his conscience and speaks to his heart. It literally has no rival, nor has ever had one 2. What may be called Metaphysical Ethics Christianity sanctions but limits in its range

Such questions as the being of God, His relation to the personal creature, or rather the relation of the personal creature to Him, the measure and reality of our knowledge of the Supreme, the bearings of His sovereignty on freedom of will, are not left for discussion; nor are those which have to do with the origin of evil and the immortality of the soul

Speculative Theology is permitted to occupy its own domain; but it is not encouraged, certainly not encouraged to intrude into the region of man's ethical duties. Some very extensive systems of Christian Ethics have been deeply vitiated by the error of forcing questions of mere speculation into the region of faith

3. The relation of Psychology to Ethics may be and should be most carefully studied. A thorough examination of the constituents of the human soul, and of the mutual relations and interactions of the intellect and the sensibilities and the will, throws much light upon the doctrines of the Fall and conversion and regeneration and sanctification. Especially important is it in relation to the connection between religious experience and religious obligations. It will be seen that in all the dealings of God with man the constitution of his nature is not interfered with. His ruin was ethical and psychological disorder; his recovery is the restoration of order through the ascendancy of the new Spirit of life, a new relation to God which regulates without violating the laws of human nature

Christianity is a life from above, a supernatural life; but it is a life that is to be conducted according to the laws which regulate human habits and the formation of character

Reference will be made to this subject again. Meanwhile there is one principle fundamental to the sciences of Psychology and Ethics which Moral Philosophy has too much forgotten. There is one personality of the moral agent behind and beneath all the constituents of his composite nature. Neither his intellect nor his feeling nor his will is the man himself, who is the unity of these elements. His intellectual nature gives him his CONSCIENCE, which is the man morally conscious of himself: his constant knowledge of himself in relation to the standard of right and wrong lodged in his reason. His sensibilities give him another moral predominant quality, LOVE, which has the same ascendancy in ethics that conscience has. His conative faculties, or his will, furnish a third moral characteristic of the whole man: the determinate bias of his INTENTION or ultimate choice. In the moral domain the man is as his intention is, as his love is, as his conscience is. These three agree in one: referring respectively to the future, the present and the past. And it is important to remember that the man himself, the person with whom the moral law deals, is the synthesis of all these, and, more than that, is the possessor of these and responsible for them. Nor is it right to say that he has conscience as an intelligent being, love as an emotional, and will as a free agent His whole being enters more or less into each and all. His conscience is a feeling as well as a knowledge His love occupies equally the three elements of his nature. And His will enters into them all THE CHRISTIAN LAW

There are two characteristics of the Christian moral legislation, mediating, as it were, between the principles of ethics and their application, which are so marked that they require to be studied apart. The first is the connection between liberty and law: and the second that between the law and love

LIBERTY AND LAW The Christian religion as the PERFECT LAW OF LIBERTY finds its perfection in the bestowment through the Holy Ghost of an internal freedom from the restraint of law which is quite consistent with subjection to external law as a directory of the life

I. There is nothing more characteristic of the Christian economy of Ethics than that it sets up an internal rule: the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus which makes us free from the law of sin and death.1 This interior rule responds to the exterior, and in a certain sense supersedes it. The external law ceases as a law of death: it has vanished with the conscience of sin removed in

pardon. And as against and over the soul with its dread impossibility of fulfillment it is also gone. The Spirit of life within gives strength for all obedience; and the law to be obeyed is set up within us, according to the promise which is the glory of the New Covenant: I will put My laws into their mind and write them in their hearts.2 This is more than the restoration of the almost effaced traces of the law engraven on the heart of universal man. In Christianity this internal law is supernatural; it is nature still, but nature restored and more than restored: a supernatural nature. This is the interior polity of holy government of which St. James speaks when he calls the Gospel the perfect law of liberty:3 perfect law becomes liberty from external obligation The nearer obedience is to the uniformity of the ordinances of nature— being conscious and willing obedience, though in its perfection not conscious of its willing—the nearer it approaches the Creator's end. Law is only the rule by which the Supreme works His will In all the economy of the physical universe His law works from within outwardly, and there is no need of any outward statute to be registered for the guidance of His unintelligent creatures. The Divine Spirit in the heart of regenerate men seeks thus to work out a perfect obedience to the law of love 1 Romans 8:2; 2 Hebrews 8:10; 3 James 1:25

1. In a loose and general way this may be called the rule of conscience, to which the Apostle refers when he says, Herein do I exercise myself to hare a conscience void of offence:1 as if the law that guided him was the decision of his own moral sense. The Scripture, however, acknowledges no rule of conscience, this being rather a witness than a governor. In modern ethical science the word is made to include both functions. First, and very generally, it is made to signify the moral faculty which discerns good from evil: as men are provided with a faculty to distinguish fair from foul, and truth from error, so they have a faculty which distinguishes the moral quality of things or right from wrong This is simply, however, the Reason whereon the Creator has written those moral principles which, never altogether effaced, are re-engraven by the Holy Ghost in regeneration as the eternal standard by which men must judge themselves. Secondly, it is the estimate whether instinctive or formed by reflection as to the conformity of our own state and act to that standard. This is CONSCIENCE proper, and the only conscience of which the Scripture speaks. It mysteriously suggests the due retribution of good and evil; but this is an attribute which sin has given it

1 Acts 24:16

2. They are distinguished as conscience objective and conscience subjective. And, uniting them, we may speak of the internal law as that of SELF-GOVERNMENT restored. The rule of God's Spirit in the spirit of the regenerate is the administration of conscience or the renewed self according to the normal idea of the Creator. Men thus trusted—under authority to that Holy Ghost yet having their own souls under them—are in the highest and purest sense a law unto themselves.1 Yet this only as under the law to Christ,2 Who is the common Lord of all 1 Romans 2:14; 2 1 Corinthians 9:21

II. For there is still an external law, containing the Christian commandments contained in ordinances, which is continued by reason of the weakness of the new nature

1. The external standard still maintains the dignity of law, and still asserts the necessity of its permanence as an institute. Nowhere does the New Testament—even when it sounds most loudly the note of liberty—proclaim that the law is abolished. From the law of sin and death1 we are delivered, not from the law that directs to holiness and life. Written in the fleshy tables of the heart,2 the commandments are deposited also in an ark on tables of stone for common appeal

among probationary creatures. The political and social legislation of the old economy has passed away, but not its eternal morals. They are reenacted under other forms, and re-written in the pages of the New Testament as the standard of requirement, the condition of the charter of privileges, and a testimony against those who offend 1 Romans 8:2; 2 2 Corinthians 3:3

2. The outward enactments are still the directory of individual duty. All relations have, in the order of the providence of the moral Governor, a sense of their obligation lodged with them in the human heart, and the law serves to educate that sense in its manifold details The best Christians need a remembrancer: they obey the law within, but are not always independent of the teaching of the law without

3. The external is the safeguard of the internal law: against its only or its chief enemy, ANTINOMIANISM, which regards the law as abolished in Christ, or treats it as if it were so

Theoretical or theological Antinomianism is the doctrine that makes a Christian's salvation eternally independent of any other obedience than that of the Gospel offer of grace, or rather than that of the vicarious Redeemer. There is a teaching which holds that the Substitute of man has not only paid the penalty of human offence but has fulfilled the law also for the sinner: thus making the salvation of the elect secure. The believer has, in this doctrine, no more to do with a legal rule save as a subordinate teacher of morality

He will never to all eternity stand before any bar to be judged by the law. Now this is the very truth of the Gospel so far as concerns the demand of the law for eternal and unbroken conformity with its precepts: no one will bear that inquisition either in the court of time or in the court of eternity. But there is only a step between precious truth and perilous error here. Christ has re-enacted His law as an Evangelical institute by which all shall be tested. The Antinomian proper is one who treats the requirement of perfect holiness as met by Christ, and refuses to measure his conduct by any law whatever. To him obedience is only matter of expediency, and propriety, and it may be reward; but not matter of life and death: his disobedience may be chastised by a Father, it cannot be eternally punished by a Judge. The law is no longer a condition of salvation: obedience not being a condition of acceptance as to the past or negative salvation, neither is it a condition of acceptance as to the future, or positive salvation. There is also a still more prevalent practical Antinomianism, which uses liberty as an occasion to the flesh.

1 This may be, or may not be, connected with the theoretical renunciation of law. It is found in all communities: the disgrace of all creeds and confessions. The written commandments are a safeguard against both forms of the common enemy. The noblest and best corrective is, as will be seen, but by love serve one another. But, besides the gentle protest of charity there is the stern protest of law with its sanctions. He who knoweth our frame has protected us, if need be, against ourselves. As the Gospel disarms the law in one sense, it arms it again in another: they are a mutual defense. He that despised Moses law died without mercy under two or three witnesses. Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy:2 but we need not fill up the quotation; suffice that it is a denunciation of those who sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth. The law protects the Gospel by protecting itself. If Christian people recite their Creed to keep in memory the things they surely believe, not less necessary is it that they should recite the Commandments also to keep in memory what they must do to enter into life 1 Galatians 5:13; 2 Hebrews 10:26-29

LOVE AND LAW

Love has been seen, in the doctrine of Sanctification, to be the principle and strength and perfection of consecration to God. In Ethics we have to consider it rather as the fulfilling energy and the fulfilled compendium of law, and the unity of these two LOVE THE COMPLEMENT OR FULFILLMENT OF LAW Love is the complement or filling up of all that is meant by law: the summary of all possible duty to God and man

1. Generally, this may be said to have been our Lord's authoritative compendium. He honored the principle as it had never been honored before. He made it the source of all the merciful dealings of God with man. He assumed its perfection for Himself: His love and His humility being the sole graces that He called His own. He made it the badge of His discipleship: the one bond of community between His people and their Lord. This thrice-honored grace the Redeemer also made the epitome of all duty in its two branches, towards God and towards man. He was not only rebuking the Pharisaic computation of the value of precepts, but spoke for all time, when He said that on these two commandments—that is on the supreme love of God, and the love of the neighbor as self—hang all the law and the prophets.1 He did not enact these laws, or this twofold law, as new; nor did He assign them a new importance in themselves. He simply declared that these were the sum of all duty, and gave them a new significance in ethical systems In the Old Testament they seemed to be AMONG the precepts; now they are OVER them

After the Lord had thus set the example it is not to be wondered at that every writer in the New Testament has paid his tribute to love. St. James leads the way by his nomon basilikan, the royal law,2 limited by him however to the love of our fellows. St. Paul's great expression is that love is the fulfilling of the law:3 in both instances of its use the meaning is limited, as in St. James, to the love of the neighbor. Again and again the New Lawgiver and His Apostles sum up all duty, not as two kinds and orders of love, but as love generally. St. Peter makes charity or love absolute the crown of the graces introduced into the life and sustained there by faith: Add... to brotherly kindness charity:4 a grace therefore that is directed both to God and to man; and, if not precisely the sum of duty, yet the crown and consummation of all. St. Paul is still more express: in his hymn to charity, the noblest ethical strain of the New Testament, agapee is evidently the substance of all personal religion; nor is there an internal grace or an external duty that is not regarded as an expression of love. The same may be said of his epitome afterwards given: Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned.5 As the end of the law is Christ, so the end of the commandment is charity: a declaration of large compass. Inverting the order of the words, pure faith leads to a cleansed conscience and purified heart, the abode of perfect love. But it is St. John who carries the tribute to its highest point. He makes the ethical Divine nature charity, God is love; and the perfection of this grace the perfection of all religion, which is, like him who possesses it, made perfect in love.6 1 Matthew 22:40; 2 James 2:8; 3 Romans 13:10; 4 2 Peter 1:5; 2 Peter 1:7; 5 1 Timothy 1:5; 6 1 John 4:16; 1 John 4:18

2. Charity in its full meaning in Christian Ethics is therefore the substance of all obligation to God and our neighbor: it might suffice to say to God; for there is no real and essential obligation but to the Supreme Lawgiver. There is no possible act of the soul that is not an act of love, as love is the return of the soul to its rest. It expresses all homage and reverence to the Divine Being, with every

affection of heart that makes Him its object; all delight in His holy law; all devotion to His service. Love to man is purely ethical as it is the reflection of the Divine love. The neighbor is united with the self as a creature; and as self, literally understood, is lost in love, love views all creatures and self included as one before God. Hence all the variety of our duty to our fellows is the expression of charity, aiming supremely at the Supreme, but reflected on all men for His sake. But we are permitted to speak of obligation to our fellows: every obligation is summed up in charity which, negatively, worketh no ill to his neighbor,1 and, positively, loves his neighbor as himself.2 1 Romans 13:10; 2 Matthew 22:40

3. The fulfillment of law in a perfect character may be regarded as the formation in the soul of a holy nature. Love is the pleeroma of religion as well as of law; the sum of all interior goodness: a life governed by this grace is necessarily holy; for all the faculties and energies of the being are united and hallowed by charity. It expels every opposite affection; it sanctifies and elevates every congenial desire. It regulates and keeps from affinity with sin every emotion. It rules with sovereign sway, as the royal law within, the will and intention that governs the life. Where pure charity is there can be no disobedience to Heaven and no injury to the neighbor; there must be all obedience to God, and all benevolence to man: therefore the whole of goodness is in the perfection of this grace. When it thus reigns within, it diffuses its influence over the intellect and its judgments: the mind conducts its operations under the authority and restraint and sure intuitions of charity, and the heart is united in God

4. The love, however, which is the anakephalaiosis, or summing up, of all law, is of necessity perfect love, such as neglects no injunction, forgets no prohibition, discharges every duty. It is perfect in passive as well as active obedience. It never faileth;1 it insures the existence of every grace adapted to time or worthy of eternity. It is the bond of perfectness.2 Therefore it is that the term perfect is reserved for this grace. Patience must have her perfect work;3 but love alone is itself perfect, while it gives perfection to him who has it 1 1 Corinthians 13:8; 2 Colossians 3:14; 3 James 1:4 LOVE THE FULFILLER

Love is the fulfiller of law, as well as the fulfillment. This general truth, which is not so directly declared as the former, is often indirectly laid down, and is very important in many ways

1. It is the energy of the regenerate soul which the Spirit uses: faith which worketh by love. When the Holy Ghost dethrones the self in the renewed spirit He makes His agent the principle that is most contrary to self, charity. Strictly speaking all men are actuated by love; but the love by which faith worketh is turned away from self and looks outward Hence it is the strongest power in our nature sanctified and set on its highest object

(1.) What love is cannot be defined: as we must think to know thought, and feel to know feeling, and will to know volition, so we must love to know the meaning of love, though even then it passeth knowledge. Something of which love in man is the highest expression is found to be as universal as life: it is as mighty in animated nature as gravitation in the world of matter. As instinct, or as merely natural affection, it achieves or seems to achieve unconsciously almost incredible wonders. But when regenerate, and made the energy of living faith, under the Holy Ghost, it is capable of the utmost task that can be laid upon it, even a full obedience to the Divine law. It is in fact the indwelling of Christ, the indwelling of God by the Holy Ghost: he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God.1 Under such a condition what is impossible? Hence it is obvious, that love as the

Divine Spirit’s instrument is more than that affection of human sensibility which generally bears the name. It is the bond of all the attributes and perfect-ness of our nature

Though it is not literally the regenerate life —any more than the essence of God is love— it is the strength of that life. It is the outgoing of the soul towards its one Supreme Object; and this movement or energy is transmitted into every manifestation of force in the moral sphere. All that is true in the physical theories of CORRELATION of forces and CONSERVATION of energy may be transferred to the domain of Ethics: save that in the omnipotent energy of the Spirit poured into the Church, and into its individual members, there is a perpetual increase of the living power that governs the moral world of Christendom. Love in the Christian life is simply and solely seeking its way back to God: that is its centripetal force. The spirit is kept from being lost again in its Creator because of the original fiat which gave it personality: that is its centrifugal force. Hence the orbit of holy duty. Love is the very strength of the Holy Ghost in the inner personality of the regenerate. It is behind the intellect and the sensibilities and the will: ruling the man who is the possessor of these. Though it derives its name from one of the middle class of these three elements of human nature, it is exalted to be over them all. And, though it has not a new name, it has a new, nature and a new prerogative, for love is of God.2 This is said of no one other grace as such 1 1 John 4:16; 2 1 John 4:7

(2.) But the strength of love as a principle of obedience may be viewed in its particular relation to God. It has all the power of gratitude: We love [Him] because He first loved us.1 If ye love Me, keep My commandments.2 If God so loved us, we ought also to love one another.3 In these sentences, combined in this order, we have the highest tribute to the strength of gratitude, as the noblest form of love. It is worthy to be the response of the Divine charity to sinful man. To it as a sentiment of grateful devotion is committed the obedience of the regenerate life. And the manifestation of this love to those around us, in imitation of the supreme charity, gives the highest nobility to virtue. It is moreover the principle of delight in the Divine character, which inspires the desire to imitate and become like God: a desire which is capable of being intensified to unlimited strength, and may become one of the mightiest impulses of the soul in man. This is either a silent, instinctive necessity of being transformed into the image of Him Whom love adores, or an active energy that has in it the potentiality of all holiness. The law, which is a transcript of the Divine nature, becomes itself the object of love: 0 how love I Thy law,4 is the note of the Psalm which sings the praises of God’s Word. As the Divine character and law are both embodied in the Incarnate Son, human love set upon Him is the strength of all holiness. Here our own words fail, and we take refuge in St. Peter’s: Whom having not seen, ye love; in Whom, though now ye see Him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.5 1 1 John 4:19; 2 John 14:15; 3 1 John 4:11; 4 Psa. 114:97; 5 1 Peter 1:8

2, Charity is the guardian of obedience: the Evangelical and better form of the Rabbinical "hedge about the law." There are two leading enemies of the righteousness of the Gospel against both and each of which it is the only and effectual safeguard. ANTINOMIANISM cannot stand in the presence of love. Its grosser and more refined forms are alike repelled. Theological dogmatic argument says: Is therefore Christ a minister of sin?1 How then can I do this great wickedness, and sin against God?2 The heart’s best enforcement of both is, 0 how love I Thy law!3 PHARISAISM, whether the spirit of a vain dependence on mechanical external obedience, or in its milder form the hireling sentiment, is utterly rejected of love. Its ethical precept warns: Thou shalt

not tempt the Lord thy God.4 This grace knows nothing of its own righteousness,5 never being able to forgive itself for sin against God, and all the less because so much has been forgiven; and it at once suppresses every tendency to the question, What shall we hate therefore?6 by another, How much owest thou unto my Lord?7 unto THE LORD!

1 Galatians 2:17; 2 Genesis 39:9; 3 Psalms 114:7; 4 Matthew 4:7; 5 Php 3:9; 6 Matthew 14:27; 7 Luke 16:5 3. Love also is the expositor of the law which it keeps and defends. It is the scribe well instructed within the heart

(1.) The enlightened and regenerate reason is of course the interpreter of the commandments; but love is the ever-present secretary of the judgment, and renders the meaning of' every law with an infinite grace peculiar to itself. This heavenly Magister Sententiarum explains the phraseology of ethics in its own sense; and defines the terms of its vocabulary in its own spirit. It does not relax the meaning of any of the most rigid of them. The Must and Ought and Shall have their full significance; the language of threatening and sanction is not softened; nor is the Moral Governor of the universe reduced to a personification of mere good nature. But charity, without abolishing or really qualifying the ethical ideas of the Scripture, transfigures both them and the language that expresses them. Yet this is only by giving the commandments their deeper meaning: the spiritual interpretation, as we call it, is really the generous interpretation of love. When the New Lawgiver ascended the Mount and opened His mouth, Love Incarnate then first disclosed the hidden mysteries of ethics; and its deep interpretation pervades the whole Sermon. Applied to the commandments generally, and to the Decalogue in particular, it reveals a new world of morals. The precepts of the first table, literally interpreted, seem cold and hard and limited: but let love interpret them according to its sentiment of perfect devotion! So it is with the other table. Let the injunctions to remember the Sabbath, to abstain from stealing, and murder, and adultery, and false witness be severally expounded by perfect charity, and how their spiritual meaning searches the heart, quickens the pulse of duty, and inflames the soul's desire!

(2.) Again, love supplies the omissions of every statute and code; being quick to discern, where the law is silent, its unexpressed meaning and inference. Love is the fulfilling or the COMPLEMENT of the law, and its SUPPLEMENT also. It fills up the interstices by a running commentary, and adds an undertone of subsidiary precepts that perfect the directory of duty. It interlineates the written code within and without, inserting its own boundless variety of unwritten commands

(3.) It is also the Casuist which settles every difficulty. There are many complications in the application of ethical principles. From the beginning there has been a special department which, under the name of CASUISTRY, presides over anomalies in morals, conflicting precepts, collision of duties and seeming incompatibilities of obligation. Here Love abounds in all judgment,1 or discrimination. It stands by the side of conscience, ever ready and seldom at a loss for the right exposition. Seldom: for there will be instances after all, Cases of Conscience, which no Casuistry will decide; scruples and doubts which no human Ductor Dubitautium can determine; and which perplex and embarrass even the sure instincts of love. But, generally, this interpreter keeps the honest Christian, who simply and only aims at perfection, right. This Casuist, sent by a heavenly commission into the court, lays down three general principles for the extrication of the embarrassed soul that desires to do its duty: first, the highest Object of obedience must invariably

and at all costs have, the preeminence; secondly, the most generous interpretation of every questionable obligation is to be preferred; and, thirdly, self as an end is always to be utterly rejected, or, so far as it is admitted subordinately as an end, it is always the self of eternity rather than the self of time. The application of these standing by-laws is illustrated by the Supreme Sovereign Himself, much of Whose legislation had to do with collisions of duty. For instance, the disciple who says, Suffer me first to go and bury my father, is bidden, let the dead bury their dead; but go thou and preach the kingdom of God.2 The voice of Christ, Who is God in His kingdom, must be supreme over every other, even the most powerful, claim. In every such case of severe collision between the pure natural instincts and the ' service of God, God must be first and He will hold His servant harmless. The earliest lesson from the lips of Jesus enforced this

Between what seemed His duty to His mother and His new vocation there was a collision: Wist ye not that I MUST be about My Father's business?3 Again, when His disciples blamed the loyal woman of the alabaster box, the Redeemer taught them a lesson: on His Person, while He was yet with them, it was impossible to be too profuse in gifts, and she who seemed too lavish was shielded: Why trouble, ye, the woman?4 Her large and liberal interpretation of duty, with the decision to which pure love brought her, was defended and commended to all the world. Lastly, of the third principle also He set in His own person the great example: He pleased not Himself.5 And when the greatest of all conflicts in ethics occurred, between the care of His own innocence and the salvation of guilty men, He surrendered the former: Not My will but Thine be done;6 and suffered Himself to be numbered with the transgressors. In Him infinite charity expounded duty

It must do the same office in us. No other principle of exposition will carry us safe through the complications of life. Expediency, common sense, reason may err: love, armed with these principles, NEVER FAILETH.7 1 Php 1:9; 2 Luke 9:59-60; 3 Luke 2:49; 4 Matthew 26:10; 5 Romans 15:3; 6 Luke 22:3; 7 1 Corinthians 13:8 LOVE THE UNITY OF FULFILLER AND FULFILMENT The perfection of the Christian system of ethics is seen in the combination of love the fulfiller and love the fulfillment of law: law and obedience to law are one in charity. To borrow terms in modern use, here is the unity of objective and subjective: a unity which impresses its various and most important influence on the whole study of New-Testament morals

1. It explains the fact that the Christian revelation is comparatively indifferent to legal codes and formal enactments. It does not dwell so much on the enforcement of specific obligations as on the vigorous maintenance of the principle of charity: love is the strength of the MUST, which at once prescribes obedience and gives the fullness of the commands to which obedience is due. It is obvious, therefore, that Christianity cannot have, like the old covenant, the distinction of moral and ceremonial and political law. Its legislation extends only where love can reign: that domain cannot be one of mere ceremonial observances; nor can it be the sphere of civil government, where charity is not the vicegerent of God. The old economy, which contained indeed latently a hint of this in Be ye holy!1 and Thou shalt love the Lord thy God!2 has vanished with all its legislation

Even its DECALOGUE, as such, is retained only because our Lord has Himself and by His Apostles exempted it from the operation of that principle, and incorporated it in the Christian statute book. Introduced into the legislation where charity is supreme, it is by our Lord reduced to one twofold principle, the love of God and of the neighbor. It is in other respects dealt with in a free spirit It is rearranged, abridged, and its spirit extracted; it undergoes also a change in the fourth

commandment, a spiritualization everywhere, and has an endless supplement added 1 Leviticus 20:7; 2 Matthew 22:37

2. Love is an active principle, the law of the movement of the whole ofMan 1:1 towards God. And, therefore, if love is both the fulfillment and fulfiller, all holiness must be no other than one concentrated and active outgoing of the strength of the whole nature of him who obeys. It does not pause to distinguish between what is forbidden and what is commanded. I will run the way of Thy commandments, when Thou shalt enlarge my heart.2 There is no mere obedience to prohibitive ordinance. The spirit that hates evil loves holiness; and, in going to the limit of every interdict, it runs to the other side and finds the perfect opposite. It avoids sin only on its way to holiness. Its resistance to evil is the resistance of love: there is no fear in love, but there is deep wrath: an anger that sins not, but abhors that which is evil and will not be content with anything less than the abolition of the sin. Hence, further, charity, as an eternal and evergrowing activity, pursues every precept into all its ramifications. Here we have again the spiritual interpretation: charity is now the well-instructed allegorist that spiritualizes every letter to infinity. It cannot ask the question: Which is the great commandment in the law?3 And it cheerfully consents to that strong word of the Moralist among the Apostles: Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.4 The ethics of love make provision everywhere that God may be all in all,5 that the very least ordinance shall be sustained by all the majesty of Heaven. He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much.6 It is impatient of greater and less in duty 1 Ecclesiastes 12:13; 2 Psa. 114:32; 3 Matthew 22:36; 4 James 2:10; 5 1 Corinthians 15:28; 6 Luke 16:10

3. Here we may recall the law of liberty,1 which is royal and perfect: royal and sovereign, in virtue of its being perfect The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ:2 the grace of the Gospel is the truth of the law; and of those who receive it we read: against such there is no law;3 which means more than that they are uncondemned by the statute. Bat the very liberty is itself law. He taketh away the first, the outer code, that He may establish the second,4 the inner. Nevertheless, the law, as we have seen, remains for a testimony, and for conviction, and for perpetual incentive. Its uses are thus summed up by the old theology: its USUS POLITICUS, to regulate common life: its USUS ELENCHTICUS, to convince of sin; its USUS DIDACTICUS, to instruct in morals The true Christian, however, is not under [the] law, but under grace.5 He is not indeed over law in the sense of being independent of it. His emancipation is only so far as grace or mercy effects it through forgiveness; but that very grace disciplines or teaches him to walk according to the strictest principles of morality. The law is neither over nor beneath the believer: it is, like the kingdom itself of which it is the rule, within us 1 James 2:12; 2 John 1:17; 3 Galatians 5:23; 4 Hebrews 10:9; 5 Romans 6:14

4. Christianity has introduced what is sometimes called the new law: it is the law of Christ;1 or the law of faith.2 Now if all law is love, and all fulfillments is love, it is obvious that there may be a righteousness of God3 attained to such a degree that the ordinance of the law might be fulfilled in us.4 Loves presides over ethics which are adapted to a disordered constitution and a lost estate. It covers a multitude of past sins and enables the believer to present what is accepted as a full obedience. Thus is that saying true: Mercy glorieth against judgment.5 If strict justice should proceed in its inquisition according to the standard of heaven and unfallen creatures, mercy or love cries, Have patience with me, and I will pay thee all:6 these my children shall be made perfect in duty. Meanwhile, its perfect work is judged according to the Evangelical standard of grace: it is

accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not.7 Whoso keepeth His word, in him verily is the love of God perfected.8

1 Galatians 6:2; 2 Romans 3:27; 3 Romans 10:3; 4 Romans 8:4; 5 James 2:13; 6 Matthew 18:26; 7 2 Corinthians 8:12; 8 1 John 2:5

5. Lastly, this teaches that there cannot possibly be any works of Supererogation. For, as law is love, love also is law. There can be no such thing as overpassing the limits of obligation. The spirit of Divine charity seems to suppress the terminology of ethics, and to change its character; but only to revive it into higher life. The vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, so far as they are Christian, are not in reality voluntary vows, but obligatory laws. Blessed are the poor in spirit! Blessed are the pure in heart! Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness!1 are benedictions pronounced upon the three severally as expressing the true Christian character. Every counsel of perfection is a commandment with promise. And, as to the whole theory on which these are founded, it may be said that Jesus the universal Lawgiver is the One DIRECTOR OF SOULS: THERE is ONE LAWGIVER,2 Who is GOD-MAN, the Lord; and His law is love, whether as to the perfect principle that keeps it, or as to the sum of the commandments which it must keep 1 Matthew 5:3; Matthew 5:6; Matthew 5:8; 2 James 4:12

BIBLICAL METHOD The New Testament, as the perfect development of the ethical teaching of progressive revelation, furnishes the rich abundance of materials from which may be constructed a systematic exhibition of applied ethics

It has been seen that the internal law which gives its character to Christianity does not supersede the external; though it gives that law a peculiar freedom and irregularity. It remains now to consider what materials there are for the construction of anything like an ethical system; how those materials are distributed, and on what principles they may be arranged. Here we have to do with the Lord and His Apostles alone

I. The Supreme Lawgiver in His ethical teaching gathered up and dissolved, re-enacted in part and in part amended, the ethics of the Old Testament

1. It is very observable that, though He spoke with a new and strange, because a Divinehuman, authority, He did not profess to promulgate a new code of laws for His disciples

He did not directly pronounce even the ceremonial law obsolete; in fact, He observed it Himself and connected its observance with many of His miracles. But He certainly gave sundry hints which were to be developed, after His perfect sacrifice, into an abrogation of the whole positive law of Moses. The national and political laws had lapsed in the order of Divine Providence. The purely moral law our Lord necessarily ratified. While He released His disciples from the ancient code as such, He honored the Decalogue, defended it from perversion, and filled out its precepts as spiritually interpreted. A very large part of His ethical teaching was a commentary on the Ten Words of the ancient code. Moreover, He laid down some new principles or gave some new counsels which were adapted to the interval during which He in His personal presence was instead of law, being the Dictator, or Director of His disciples in an intermediate order of things

Thus many of His precepts were not of permanent obligation, but adapted to the purpose of those days. Such were some of the positive commandments, which sound like absolute precepts, to sell

all that thou hast . . . and come, follow Me.1 Others, on the contrary, He laid down rather for future use, after the Spirit should have fully come. Such were those which prescribed prayer in His Name and the assembling of His people, and so forth

Again, there were innumerable indications of His will given through the medium of His miracles; and not a few precedents of morals established by Him as Supreme Judge. But it may be said generally that He taught those parts of His ethical system which were most special and characteristic— such as the virtue of humility and self-denial—by His own example. He left all these materials for His Apostles rather than leave a system of His own. His life, His words, and His works were to them and are to us a boundless accumulation of the highest ethics. His last personal question and His last personal command illustrate everything that has been said. Lovest thou Me? shows that love was the spring of all obedience. Follow thou Me!2 shows that imitation of His example was the supreme morality 1 Luke 18:22; 2 John 21:17; John 21:22

2. The Apostles, when His words were brought to their remembrance, followed the Master's example, and dealt with the new ethics precisely in His Spirit

(1.) In the Acts new obligations arise, and a peculiar class of duties with them: the descent of the Holy Ghost, the formation of the new Church, the claims of devotion to the ascended Redeemer, the demands of the Gentile world, all conspired to create a new order of ethical obligations, demanding a new order of precepts. In the Epistles, however, we have the abundant exposition of the new morals of Christianity, as the Spirit brought the Master's words to the disciples' remembrance, or inspired them to make new applications of those words. It is impossible to compare the Gospels and the Epistles without perceiving that the Same Teacher is in both, as also that there is the same manner of teaching. In the Epistles there is more statement of doctrinal truth; but, as in the Gospels, we find that there is not a solitary revelation of truth which has not, directly or indirectly, and almost always directly, an application to practice. As in the Master's days, occasional circumstances give rise to important decisions. The precedents of the Lord's Ethical Court are many

(2.) The Epistles teach largely by application of principles to individual cases. They open up a wide field of their own, however, in the relations between the duties and obligations of the Christian fellowship and those of personal religion: hence the new ethical word oikodomeen, and the inculcation of all that belongs to EDIFICATION, corporate and individual. But the ethical glory of the Epistles is to be found in three departments which are opened and consecrated to this service. First, they bring all into dependence on UNION WITH CHRIST through that indwelling of His Holy Spirit which is the unity and common bond of the Lord and His people. It we embrace this as truth and as more than mere figure, and in the light of it read the New Testament, we shall find that the entire field of ethics is illuminated by it. Again, the LAST THINGS begin to enter the field with peculiar solemnity and pathos, giving to all the Epistles in some parts, and St. Peter's throughout, a specific and indescribable tone. Finally each writer has his own constellation of GRACES AND VIRTUES, the consummate beauty as well as the ethical completeness of which cannot be exaggerated. So perfect are they that an exposition of these little compendiums of morals would furnish a system of universal Christian Ethics. Not that there is anything in the Epistles of which the Gospels contain no intimation. Every Apostle is still only a disciple of Jesus,1 ematheeteuthee too leesou, and only develops more fully the principles laid down by Him: neither in doctrine nor in

morals does the stream of Apostolic teaching rise higher than the fountain in the Master

1 Matthew 27:57

3. Nowhere in the New Testament do we find any trace of such an outline of Ethics as should guide future systematization. The nearest approach is the Sermon on the Mount, with which in the Epistles corresponds St. Paul's great ethical chapter in the Romans 1:1-32 But our Lord's Discourse was a spiritual commentary on the Decalogue. He takes its last precept, which forbids the evil lust of the heart, and makes it the point of connection with His own new legislation. St. Paul immediately after his exposition of the graces which flow from entire consecration to God, introduces the second table of the Decalogue, and in such a way as to intimate that he acknowledged it as the compendium of Christian duty. It may be well, therefore, at this point to consider the claims of this one summary of moral obligation, and to give the reasons why it is not adopted as our basis 1 Romans 12:1-21 THE DECALOGUE The DECALOGUE, hee dekalogos sc. biblos nomothesia, was the central obligatory code of the Old Covenant: the most ancient as it is the most perfect of all summaries of moral duty

1. Though given to a special people, and with circumstantials and appendages of limited application, it is universal and for the world. Its dignity was impressed by this, that it was given by Jehovah Himself, while Moses was the organ of the other legislation. There is a difference between the original account in Exodus and the recession in Deuteronomy; but they concur in making the commandments ten: THE TEN WORDS or THE TEN COMMANDMENTS, containing the Covenant specially so called, and therefore deposited in the Ark of Testimony in the centre of the sanctuary. The Decalogue was written on two tables of stone, inscribed on both sides; and obviously divides the precepts in the middle, five having reference to God and containing the Praecepta pietatis, and five referring to man and containing the Praecepta probitatis. Reverence to parents regards them as representative of God: even as Pietas in the old Latin combined the two

2. These two Tables, brought into the New Testament and expounded on the principle of the Sermon on the Mount, might be made the basis of all moral teaching. Their spiritual interpretation would furnish all the necessary principles of ethics. The Preface is a glorious announcement of the Personality and Supremacy of God: the foundation of all religion, and the ground of obligation for all that follows. To the children of Israel He was the Jehovah who brought them out of Egypt; to Christians the God of universal redemption; to all men everywhere the One and only Moral Governor. The first commandment enjoins the supreme homage of the One God: its Jehovah has become the Holy Trinity; and the spiritual interpretation of this law lays down all the principles of theological faith in the Triune God, with the life of holy devotion and obedience which corresponds with that faith. The second prescribes the spiritual worship which alone the Deity will accept. Literally, it interdicts idolatry and the use of emblems to denote the unseen Being; by anticipation, therefore, condemning the superstitious ceremonial and honor paid to images in degenerate Christendom. Spiritually, it further searches the chambers of imagery and forbids every creaturely rival of the Supreme and Only Object of the soul's delight. The third commands the profoundest reverence of the Divine Majesty, and forbids the irreverent use of the Holy Name in needless oath and light swearing. Spiritually, it enjoins an awful reverence of the Divine Presence: not only in His worship, where it requires the most perfect and all-pervasive sincerity in every thought, word, and act that has Him for its Object, but also in the whole of life, which must be conducted, down to its

slightest details, in His Name which is the Name of His Son our Lord. The fourth ordains the observance of public worship of the One God, the ordinance for all ages of an appointed day including the whole service of religion. This commandment undergoes a remarkable change: while in Exodus the memorial of the Creation is mentioned, in Deuteronomy, which looks within and also goes forward to Christian days, deliverance from Egyptian slavery, pointing to Greater Redemption, are alone introduced. The spiritualization of this precept makes the worship of God a perpetual rest, and connects all with the final rest of heaven. The fifth attaches an especial honor to parents: not only as parents, however, but as representing all lawful authority; both Divine and human. Moreover, it is the link between the Two Tables: placed in the first, it undoubtedly belongs also to the second. The sixth forbids murder and every passion that leads to it. The spiritual application of this short precept is perhaps the widest of all in its range: as to the neighbor, it includes every act that shows an undervaluation of the worth of his life down to the slightest thought or word of hatred or violence; while, as to self, it includes every passion and practice that tends to the injury of personal life and well-being, intemperance and excess of every kind. The seventh includes in the word adultery all sins that war against the purity of the sexual relations: of its spiritual range our Lord has given us His own most suggestive illustration. The eighth protects property and forbids dishonesty in act and thought: here then will come in the whole substance of the ethics of property with its rights and obligations; and the highest spiritual interpretation, remembering that men eternally owe love to one another, will make it the basis of all the self-sacrificing ethics of the Gospel of Charity. The ninth protects the character of the neighbor, and forbids slander in every degree, and through all its stages along the whole line of its vocabulary. The last is as it were a Deuteronomical repetition on the one hand, and an advance towards the Sermon on the Mount on the other. It forbids the lust of the heart, and is again and again alluded to in the New Testament as carrying the commandments of the Second Table into the region of the hidden man where his original sin forges every species of iniquity 3. But the Decalogue, as such, has not often been used as the basis of an exposition of Christian Ethics

(1.) There has been no slight difference of view from the beginning as to the principles of its own internal order; and this contention itself has tended to prevent its adoption

Augustine, followed by the Roman Catholic Church, and in this by the Lutherans also, reduced the first two precepts to one; thus giving three commandments to the First Table The Second Table then contains seven, the tenth being subdivided. The ancient Jews did not thus divide the tenth; but left the prohibition of all concupiscence untouched and alone. They, however, sundered the first into two, preceded by a Preface: the former of the two simply imposed belief in the Supreme and Perfect Being. Josephus and Philo, followed by the Early Christian Church, and the Greek and Re-formed of modern times, adopted that order which, as in our English Bibles, is in general acceptance

(2.) There are, however, reasons in the Code itself which make it an inadequate foundation of an ethical system: reasons which have been already more than suggested, and may here be more fully referred to. Generally, it cannot be questioned that the Decalogue as such, and as part of the Israelitish legislation, was abrogated: that is to say, it survived the passing away of the old economy because of its eternal moral principles; principles which are reproduced, and more fully explained and based upon their true grounds by the Saviour’s new legislation. While, therefore, the Ten Commandments still remain, in their Hebrew form, as a memorial of the past, and,

stripped of Hebrew appendages, as binding on all nations, they are not the obligatory statement of the entire morals of Christianity. Moreover, it is obvious that the negative and limited character of some of the precepts does not fit them to be the formal expression of the perfect law of liberty: the very fact that they require so large a spiritual and positive expansion makes it embarrassing to hang on them all the precepts and aspirations of Christianity. Again, our Lord has indicated His will on this subject by summarizing all our duty into the one supreme commandment of love in its two branches: including, not merely the Decalogue, but the whole compass of moral precepts: ALL the law and the Prophets.1 And, in His Sermon, which has been spoken of as a Commentary on the Decalogue, there is a large body of ethical teaching that cannot, without considerable violence, be brought into direct reference to any of its precepts. When we study morality in the Apostolical Epistles we find the same independence of the Ten Words as a formal code. In fact, very much of their ethical grandeur lies in a region beyond any commandments contained in ordinances: in the region, namely, of the experiences and aspirations and attainments of the Christian life. Hence, to sum up, while the Ten Commandments are of eternal obligation, they are not the adequate basis of Christian Ethics: they serve better for a standing witness and testimony to the conscience before God than as the program of systematic moral theology

1 Matthew 22:40 SYSTEMATIC CHRISTIAN ETHICS

Having considered Ethics in their specifically Christian principles, we shall now treat these principles as applied: first, as forming the Christian character, personal and individual; and, secondly, as regulating all external relations. But this distinction cannot be observed rigidly

It is obvious that we adopt here the most natural and easy arrangement. There is a sense in which no such distinction as this can be justified, inasmuch as the internal character is dependent on the discharge of external obligations. But if we press this too far, we lose our systematic arrangement altogether, and the loss would be great PERSONAL ETHICS OF THE INDIVIDUAL LIFE The internal obligations of the Christian life may be presented in an endless variety of ways. The following scheme embraces all, and with some attempt at the order of their development: first come the ethics of Preliminary Grace or Conversion; then such as deal with the Ultimate Intention of the new nature; then those of the Internal Conflict; then those of Consecration to Divine service; and lastly the ethics of Devotion as expressed in the spirit and habit of worship ETHICS OF THE PRELIMINARY GRACEOF CONVERSION

Christian Ethics begin, in a certain sense, before the regeneration of the soul. There is a range of duties and obligations incumbent on the awakened sinner, for which sufficient grace is given. This branch of morals has been included in the general question of Preliminary Grace; and must only be touched upon here as introductory to Christian Ethics proper 1. Generally the whole moral law is incumbent on sinners as such, from beginning to end

There is a perpetual interdict, Thou shalt not! and a perpetual injunction, Thou shalt! even though the strength to abstain and to do may as yet be wanting. These may be regarded as the ethics of a state of slavery to sin. In this case the law is set for conviction of sin, and of sinfulness its source, and of the utter impotence of the mind unrenewed, demanding always repentance with all that has been described as belonging to it. Those who yield to the influences of the restraining and prompting Spirit of conviction, and strive to cease to do evil and learn to do well,1 are in the way of duty approved by God. It is wrong to say that all sincere works done before regeneration are only

splendid vices, and counted by the Judge as evil: however true it is that they are not meritorious, and can do nothing towards justification, they are in the way of preparation for Divine acceptance. It is incorrect even to affirm that there is no ethical duty possible to the unregenerate. "We have seen that there is a religious life before the regenerate life, and it has its morals

There are fruits meet for repentance,2 which are also the fruit of the Spirit,3 though not yet the Spirit of regeneration 1 Isaiah 1:6; 2 Matthew 3:8; 3 Galatians 5:22

2. The very faith that introduces the soul to salvation through union with Christ must be preceded by, or rather must include, a submission to the Mediatorial Redeemer which is an ethical law incumbent on every redeemed rebel as such. It is the duty of every living sinner who hears the proclamation of the Gospel to yield compliance to the supreme will of Christ. His conscience tells him this, and it is at his peril that he refuses. There is a doctrine indeed which removes the foundation of this ethical responsibility. But it is not the doctrine taught by the New Testament It is unnecessary, however, to dwell on these topics, as they have been abundantly exhibited already

3. It may be added, that, after conversion, this same repentance and faith do not cease to be ethical obligations. Penitence in sundry forms is both the grace and the duty of religion to the end: it may even be a profounder sorrow in the sanctified than in the unregenerate; and even when it becomes only the acknowledgment, sorrowful yet always rejoicing, of the sin which is through Divine grace entirely gone, it is repentance still. And as to faith, or self-renouncing submission to Mediatorial authority and acceptance of the Mediator’s Person, it is literally made perfect in the Christian life. But on these, and on all other topics connected with the transformations of preliminary ethics in the regenerate estate, we shall speak more fully hereafter ETHICS OF THE ULTIMATEINTENTION The direction of the supreme aim of the soul is foremost in the ethics of the established regenerate life. These are classed under three general heads: first, the Glory of God, in all the forms of that highest intention; secondly, the Will of Christ, as the specific Christian end of life; and, thirdly, the Perfection of our entire nature, as the issue of both these in their combination This department includes a wide range of the ethical principles of the New Testament. It may be said, indeed, to embrace them all, as there is no temper of the soul or action of the life, whether regarding self or regarding others, which is not under the government of the ultimate choice of the will. But we must strictly limit ourselves to the characteristics of holy intention as such

I. Perhaps the final expression of the end of the Christian life is that given by St. Paul: do all to THE GLORY OF GOD.1 1 1 Corinthians 10:31

1. The highest example and illustration of the maxim is to be found in our Lord, Who, when leaving the world, said: I have glorified Thee on the earthy having finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do.1 His whole human career as the supreme pattern had this for its supreme object: to render a perfect tribute to the glory of the Divine Name, to reflect that glory from Himself, and to bring men to render God His glory. These three combined are the highest definition we can conceive of the meaning of a phrase which has been adopted always to express the ultimate and noblest aim of creaturely life

1 John 17:4

2. But the last branch of the definition indicates that living to the glory of God has a specifically Christian meaning. It is very specially St. Paul's expression, who places it on the ground of redemption: for ye were bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body,1 redeemed equally with the spirit. The honor of the Triune God of the Gospel salvation is now the final end of the Christian life. The Corinthian Epistle, which uses the term more than any other, begins by showing that God in Christ has taken all human glorying away, and made Himself the one Object of all glorying: that no flesh should glory in His presence2 is on one side of the Redeemer's finished work, and he that glorieth let him glory in the Lord on the other. When all shall be accomplished it is said that the Lord shall come to be glorified in His saints.3 In these passages we have the two ideas of rendering God His tribute and reflecting His honour from ourselves. The third idea, that of bringing others to glorify Him, that is, of so acting as to secure His honor, occurs again and again: Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or do anything, do all to the glory of God:4 where the uppermost thought is, that every action may be so ordered as not to bring dishonor upon the Author of the Gospel. The reference here is to comparatively insignificant things; but elsewhere, the highest range of duty is referred to the same end: If any man speaketh, speaking as it were oracles of God; if any man minister, ministering as of the ability that God giveth; that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ.5 Thus every thought and every word and every action must in Christian Ethics aim to honor God, to reflect His grace, and to shield His name from reproach; and in these three senses Christians live TO THE GLORY OF GOD 1 1 Corinthians 6:20; 2 1 Corinthians 1:29-31; 3 2 Thessalonians 1:10; 4 1 Corinthians 10:31; 5 1 Peter 4:11 3. As an ethical principle this widest and most comprehensive law may assume some other forms and names

(1.) It is the making God the one object of life: the meaning or thinking or intending the Supreme Triune, and in each Person, in all things from the least to the greatest. This is what our Lord has called the SINGLE EYE, which looks at the Divine will as the directory and end of every action. The lamp of the body is the eye; if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light,1 on which closely follows, Ye cannot serve God and mammon2 full force of this precept is seen if we connect with it two other passages. Your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost;3 and His interior light shines upon the eye that gives light to the whole of that life of which the body is the organ. And, beholding God in all things, we obey the injunction: sanctify Christ as Lord in your hearts,4 in the centre of your entire personality of soul and body. Thus we have the full thought of a single eye to the glory of God. Elsewhere this grace is called SIMPLICITY: he that giveth let him do it with simplicity,5 where our Lord's haplous becomes en haploteeti Purity of intention and singleness of aim are united in simplicity and godly sincerity.6 These make up that UNITY of aim, as opposed to multiplicity of regards and distraction of motives, for which the Psalmist prayed: I will walk in Thy truth; unite my heart to fear Thy name.7 This principle of a fixed and habitual reference of every action to the will of God pervades the Scripture, and is one of the glories of its ethical teaching

1 Matthew 6:22; 2 Matthew 6:24; 3 1 Corinthians 6:19; 4 1 Peter 3:15; 5 Romans 12:8; 6 1 Corinthians 1:12; 7 Psalms 86:11

(2.) It is presented in another form as the aim to PLEASE GOD, with its reflex, the consciousness of pleasing Him. One of the first definitions of a perfect godliness in the Bible is the word concerning Enoch that he walked with God,1 which in the New Testament is explained that he pleased God.2 Here again we have the Supreme Example, that of Him who pleased not Himself,3

and Who once declared of Himself, I do always those things that please Him.4 It was His aim to please His Father, and it must be ours: He could say I DO ALWAYS; we in His strength must copy Him. Thus we may close as we began with our Lord's example, Who never spoke but of two aims in His life, the glory of His Father's name, and the pleasing Him in doing His will. But the honor due to God belongs to Christ Himself 1 Genesis 5:24; 2 Hebrews 11:5; 3 Romans 15:3; 4 John 8:29

(3.) The Apostle Paul bids the Colossian servants to serve not with eyeservice, as menpleasers; but in singleness of heart fearing God. This passage, with its parallel to the Ephesians, teaches that to please God, to please the Lord, is to fear Him; and thus the glory of God and the pleasing Him are really one. Unite my heart to fear Thy name1has almost its perfect echo in these words: in an undivided heart fearing the Lord. Moreover, it teaches what the whole Scripture teaches, that, as there can be only one object of fear, so there can be only One Being to be pleased. The ethical purity of this intention consists in its soleness and supremacy. Do I seek to please men? for, if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.2 1 Psalms 86:11; 2 Galatians 1:10

II. The Christian Lawgiver, unlike any other in the history of religion, presents Himself to His people as the Object of their final intention in all things. This truth appears in several lights

1. It is exhibited as the bringing all life into entire DEVOTION TO THE LORD JESUS. Our Savior is our God, and therefore He is the End of the soul as well as its Redeemer. The term end being most literally understood, the ethics of Christianity permit this application: for to me to live is Christ.1 If it signifies more generally a leading purpose in the whole tenor of probation, it is supported by St. Paul again: whether we live, we live unto the Lord.2 The Christian is thus also under the law to Christ;3 and that most absolutely, for the entire strain of the New Testament, even more than isolated texts, shows nothing in the vista of human duty and aspiration beyond the will of the Incarnate Jesus. This is a distinctively Christian end and aim in all things: and its supremacy as such is proved by the remainder of the passage already quoted: whether we die, we die unto the Lord. Lest, however, this should be supposed to mean only that in the Divine order Jesus of Nazareth has the destinies of men put into His hands, the Apostle says: whether we live therefore or die we are the Lords. We are not now proving the Divinity of the Incarnate. Here, indeed, is absolute demonstration: for of none but the Supreme can it be said that the creature is His, and lives and dies to Him. But the specific ground of this devotion of the being to Jesus is the fact of His redeeming purpose and redeeming rights: to this end Christ died and revived, that He might be the Lord of the dead and of the living.4 As to this nothing more need be said than that the same argument is used concerning God and His Christ: Ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body.5 1 Php 1:21; 2 Romans 14:8; 3 1 Corinthians 9:21; 4 Romans 14:9; 5 1 Corinthians 6:20

2. This is the place to dwell upon that negative end of life, which is almost the peculiarity and altogether the glory of the Christian system: the entire renunciation, or rather the entire forgetfulness of, SELF as the end of our actions: its utter extinction as the final intention of anything we think, or speak, or do. Forgetfulness, mark well: a most important truth has been aimed at by the word negative; for if the annihilation of selfends is made a positive end itself, the ethical grandeur of unselfishness is lost Hence the affecting connection of this principle with the example of Christ. If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow Me:1 here the following of Christ is the sum of the new life, the daily cross its constant

element, the absolute renunciation of self as an end is the introductory condition: not the less an introductory condition, because the general company of the Redeemer's disciples are ever learning it, and do not come to the full knowledge of its truth, down to the last. Observe, however, that we speak only of the Ultimate Principle and scope of life. Self may still remain as a subordinate end: Work out your own salvation! Look not every man on his own things, but every man ALSO on the things of others. All seek their own, not the things which are Jesus Christ's.2 These various words follow the Apostle's exhibition of the Supreme Example of self-renunciation: let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus. Here is the suppression of self. They then show that the self which is lost is found again in Christ, and is an object of care combined with the neighbor, that care of self working out the will of God. The Philippian chapter contains the perfect doctrine of Self 1 Luke 9:23; 2 Php 1:4-5; Php 1:12; Php 1:21

3. This leads to the IMITATION OF CHRIST, which has been and will be alluded to: here it is also a supreme intention in life. There is no higher end than to become like Him, Who is the Perfect Good Incarnate: There is none good but One, that is, God;1 that is, Christ, God in man. There is no higher tribute to the Supreme than to endeavor to be like Him: imitari quern colis. Our Lord, who at the beginning bade His disciples imitate the perfections of their Father which is in heaven,2 ended His teaching by commanding the emulation of Himself. His last word to an individual on earth made both the duty and the individuality of it prominent: follow thou Me.3 But here we must remember what has been already made emphatic, that our Lord has set before us an example, not so much of the means, as of the result of Christian endeavor. If He makes Himself the Pattern in the pursuit of it, it is always and only as He is the model of the renunciation of self. In that alone is He expressly proposed as an example 1 Matthew 19:17; 2 Matthew 5:44-48; 3 John 21:22

III. Another ultimate ethical aim is the attainment of the perfection of the individual character, as the issue of personal striving after nothing less than the realization of all the will of God, and thus by Divine grace making the result our own 1. Generally, nothing is more certain than that this high ideal is set before the Christian

One of the first words of the New Lawgiver was: Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.1 The word teleioi implies the possible attainment of the telos, the end or moral goal, of all life. This was the new aspiration introduced into ethics by our Lord, Who made His heavenly Father the standard, reproduced upon earth by Himself, of all moral excellence, as summed up in Charity, which all His followers must aspire to reach

1 Matthew 5:48

2. That supreme standard must be aimed at by the Christian, depending on Divine grace, from the very beginning of his career of discipleship through all its processes to the end

(1.) Our Lord said to one who came to Him, If thou wilt be perfect!1 thus engaging him to the pursuit of perfection at the outset, and applying a severe test to his sincerity of intention. He was required to give the first pledge of his determination by selling all that he had for the poor. Christ made Himself the standard: everyone that is perfect shall be as his Master.2 Here the word and the application are different; but the meaning is that those who have become His disciples must aim to share His moral perfection 1 Matthew 19:21; 2 Luke 6:40

(2.) The processes of the Christian life must all be conducted under the inspiration of this lofty incentive. It has been seen how the Holy Spirit administers the Atonement as a provision for making men perfect before the law, perfect as children of God, and perfect as sanctified to the Divine fellowship. It will be enough now to indicate that in these three departments Christians are taught to aspire to perfection by their own co-operant effort

These things write I unto you, that ye sin not.1 He that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as He is righteous.2 These words confirm St. Paul's: that the righteousness of the law may be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.3 And without controversy they teach that the religious walk must aim at a perfect satisfaction, through Divine grace, of every requirement of law. As the children of God we are exhorted to keep the same high aspiration before us, that ye may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God without rebuke:4 tried by the highest standard, without fault, without interior stain, without reproach of God or man, being in the Divine purpose which becomes a human aim conformed to the image of HisSong of Solomon 5:1-16 As St. John says, Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin:6 at least, the tenor of his aspiration is to live in a state of sacred freedom from sin and likeness to the Son of God, Who was manifested to take away our sins, and in Him is no sin.7 Thus there is a perfection of the regenerate estate which is an ideal that diligence strives to realize. So also the exhortation runs in the temple of Divine consecration: Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God.8 The end of the application of the Atonement is to make the comers thereunto perfect. For by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.9 The Divine teteleiooken expresses a design that becomes human in the Corinthian epitelountes, which, as no one will deny, makes the perfection of sanctity a Christian aim. It may be added that individual graces are to be trained to their own several perfection: for instance, let patience have her perfect work,10 one grace of the perfectMan 1:11 at least of the man who aspires to perfection, who looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein:12 looks into it for ever with the inextinguishable ardor of determination to be a doer of the work in its perfection and to be blessed in his deed 1 1 John 2:1; 2 1 John 3:7;

3 Romans 8:4; 4 Php 2:15; 5 Romans 8:29; 6 1 John 3:9; 7 1 John 3:5; 8 2 Corinthians 7:1; 9 Hebrews 10:1; Hebrews 10:14; 10 James 1:4; 11 James 3:2; 12 James 1:25

(3.) Finally, there is an aspiration to perfectness which is not purely ethical, though that element is not excluded. St. Paul's most intense expression of the one end of his life, This one thing!1 had reference to the final consummation of body and soul in union with Christ. Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfected! His view of the finished perfection of his entire nature stops not short of the resurrection. For that of course he depends on the fidelity of his Lord. But even that he makes his own aim: 1 press on if so be that I may apprehend that for which also I was apprehended by Christ Jesus. He exhorts the spiritually perfect to press on to the perfection of the last change when the perfection of earth shall put on the perfection of heaven. How far this entered into his ethical aim is obvious. It gives its sublime peculiarity to the whole passage: This one thing!

1 Php 3:12-13

(4.) The end of time is eternity, and the end of life is the eternal union with God. The finite may seek the Infinite. The highest aspiration of the saint must be, through life and all the varieties of

probation, to see God and be one with Him for ever. This may be and must be the final intention. I shall be satisfied when I awake with Thy likeness!1 Not preparation for death, nor preparation for meeting God in judgment, but preparation to be with Him eternally! DEUS MEUS ET OMNIA!

1 Psalms 17:15 ETHICS OF THE SPIRITUALCONFLICT The Christian personality is the sphere of a contest between two opposing principles which are variously described. The struggle is between the new man and the old, or the flesh and the Spirit, or the believer and Satan. The peculiarity of this conflict depends upon the doctrine of the probationary union of the regenerate with Christ the Captain of our salvation. It appears in another form in all systems of ethics, which refer to the discord between the worse and the better self; but Christianity alone gives the key to this mystery in human nature. A very large department of the moral teaching of the New Testament is occupied with the detail of virtues and duties which spring out of the spiritual warfare on which our probation depends. These topics must be taken in their order The doctrinal aspect of this internal discord has been already given; we deal now only with the ethical, and confining our attention to the one idea of the conflict. Many of the ethical principles and definitions are of course exhibited under other heads. It will conduce to precision if we consider the subject first in reference to the two opposite elements with their contrasted virtues and vices in particular, and then in reference to the various ethical duties and grace, arising out of their relation to each other generally, and as common to all THE WARFARE IN FELLOWSHIP WITH CHRIST

Though every part of the New Testament refers to the general principles of the contest, St. Paul is the only teacher who gives us a complete view of the two forces contending in the regenerate. He therefore must be our main guide in this department; and his teaching, as summing up the whole of Scripture, represents the ethical contest as no other than the believer’s fellowship in the Redeemer’s conflict and victory. This is the profound bond which unites all the various descriptions of the good fight of faith.1 This entire department of Ethics is reduced to the prosecution of a contest which is in the Christian the renewal and continuation of his Master’s contest and victory. Union with Christ stamps it$ impress on the whole doctrine of the regenerate conflict. To set this in a clear light requires only the consideration of a few passages which connect the Saviour’s Headship with each department of the spiritual warfare in its two branches: first, in the struggle of the new man with the old man still remaining within him; and, secondly, as the contest of the new man with the external forces of evil; these combining in the common idea of our union with the Lord in our temptation 1 1 Timothy 6:12 THE INTERNAL STRUGGLE

I. It is peculiar to St. Paul to describe the contest as between the old man and the new, and as between the flesh and the Spirit. In the former Christ is viewed as Himself the life of the believer, raised from the dead with Him; in the latter Christ is viewed as by His Spirit contending against the remains of the evil nature. The two are really one, but each has its distinct range

1. The doctrine of regeneration has given us all the elements of distinction. In many passages St. Paul speaks of the old man and the new man in seeming, though only seeming, independence of Christ. The one personality of the regenerate includes a new nature and an old for a time coexisting. The residuary old man is again regarded as having an organic body of his own, the body of sin:1 in this, by its members which are upon the earth,2 it performs the deeds of the body.3 It is the body of this death4 with which the Apostle struggled before he was regenerate, and with which, though under better auspices, he struggled afterwards. In the former struggle the

inward man is brought into captivity to the law of sin;5 in the latter, that of which we now speak, the process is inverted: Ye have put off the old man with his deeds, and have put on the new man;6 knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that henceforth we should not serve sin.7 Sin, therefore, though remaining, is no longer the master. This is the glory of Christian ethics 1 Colossians 3:9; 2 Romans 6:6; 3 Colossians 3:5; 4 Romans 8:13; 5 Romans 7:22-24; 6 Colossians 3:9; 7 Romans 6:6

2. But again that one personality is a man in Christ,1 and the new nature is no other than Christ formed in you,2 as if His sacred morphoo, or form, were impressed on the spirit through the Holy Ghost, of Whom it is said, he that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit.3 St. Paul tells the Colossians that they have put on the newMan 1:4 using the same word as that to the Romans, put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ;5 and the combination of the two passages shows that the new man is not so much our nature renewed as Christ in it, and also that the Christian conflict is the effort on our part to gain the ascendancy of the new man over the old. This new man is the Last Adam, a quickening Spirit,6 within the soul; and this term spirit is the link between the doctrine of the two men, or the two Adams, in the regenerate and the ethical application of it to which we now pass 1 2 Corinthians 12:2; 2 Galatians 4:19; 3 1 Corinthians 6:17; 4 Colossians 3:10; 5 Romans 13:14

II. Hence the contest is not between a new nature and an old simply, but between the Holy Spirit of Christ and what is called, in this view, the Flesh. It is important to define these two opposite principles, and the nature of the conflict between them

1. The Flesh is nowhere more fully described than when it is opposed to the Holy Spirit as the principle of regenerate life. There are in the New Testament abundant references to the fallen nature of man; but none which equals St. Paul's Galatian picture of its works, as they are manifest in the world, and by the natural conscience evidently condemned. They are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like.1 These are an expansion of the Lord's words concerning what proceeds out of the heart.2 St. Paul's catalogue includes the evil thoughts, thefts, false witness, blasphemies. To this catalogue covetousness, which is idolatry,3 is added elsewhere; and it thus includes every form of sin against God, against the neighbor, and against the self; against social, political, and ecclesiastical society. These sins are known and read of all men; Christian ethics do not require any definition of them; they are manifest. St. James in sacred satire says of them: This wisdom descendeth not from, above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish,4 the middle term connecting them with St. Paul's works of the flesh.5 They are the best product of the thoughts of the old man with his deeds.6 They are the filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness7 which Christians must lay apart. Over against all these St. Paul sets the one fruit of the Spirit, which is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance:8 graces which are set in peaceful array against the turbulent army of lawless vices. St. Peter sums up all in another antithesis: on the one side the corruption that is in the world through lust,9 for the works of the flesh; and for the fruit of the Spirit, the becoming partakers of the Divine nature, which is in St. James the wisdom that is from above.10

1 Galatians 5:17-21; 2 Matthew 15:19; 3 Colossians 3:5; 4 James 3:15; James 3:17; 5 James 1:21; 6 Galatians 5:19; 7 Colossians 3:9; 8 Galatians 5:22-23; 9 2 Peter 1:4; 10 James 3:17

2. The conflict between these in Christian Ethics must be carefully stated. St. Paul's leading text runs thus: The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other, that ye may not do the things that ye would.1 The same word epithumei, which expresses the not yet extirpated bias of original sin in the nature, must be referred to the Spirit's new original bias in the spirit regenerate. If decorum would suggest a different word in the latter case, we may adopt it; but the meaning still remains, that, while the flesh would hinder us from doing what we would as regenerate, the Spirit hinders us from doing what we would as yielding to the impulse of the remainder of sin. But it must be observed that there is a difference between this contest and that described in the seventh chapter to the Romans. There the conflict is a failing one on the side of the man under conviction but not yet regenerate. It is not between the Spirit, as the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus,2 and the flesh; but between the flesh and the law of my mind, or the nous, under the striving of the Holy Ghost. This conflict is a fruitless struggle against a power bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members.3 In the regenerate contest the watchword is: Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh.4 It is the characteristic of the ethics of the Christian warfare that the Holy Spirit of Christ in the regenerate spirit secures the possibility of a constant victory. Still, it is a contest; the extinction of sin, and of the flesh, is not assumed; the Flesh is still, as we shall see, the source of temptation for a season 1 Galatians 5:17; 2 Romans 8:2; 3 Romans 7:23; 4 Galatians 5:16 III. We may now consider the relation of this conflict to our union with Christ and our temptation with Him

1. St. James gives us the nearest approach to a definition of the process of temptation from within. Every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed.1 Temptation proper, in the case of a fallen creature, is strictly speaking within. It craves the gratification that is offered from without: then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin.2 The contest in the regenerate man is this lust of the flesh opposing the Spirit of the new nature; and the Spirit continually moving the renewed spirit to oppose its desires In this sense our first parents were not tempted, though in their case the temptation from without assailed a will capable of falling and was the means of engendering the concupiscence that then engendered all sin. In this sense the entirely sanctified from sin are not tempted; though in their case the will that has known transgression is still liable to fall and all the more because of the remaining effects of eradicated evil. In this sense the glorified in heaven, after a probation ended, will be incapable of temptation. In this sense our sinless Redeemer was absolutely both untemptable and impeccable. He was in all points tempted like as we are, as without sin:3 that is, He was tried at all points as we are tried, so far as was consistent with the entire absence of the element that could conceive sin. In this sense, finally, God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He anyMan 1:4 He permits the temptation in the regenerate, but His Spirit striveth against the flesh.5 And, in that the renewed spirit is enabled to vanquish every temptation consists the difference between this species of temptation and that of the unregenerate involved as yet in the snare of the devil, who are taken alive by him at his will.6 1 James 1:14; 2 James 1:15; 3 Hebrews 4:15; 4 James 1:13; 5 Galatians 5:17; 6 2 Timothy 2:26

2. Hence it will be obvious that the Christian's union with his Lord in this interior temptation must be carefully defined and limited. Not of this inward conflict does the Savior speak when He says: ye are they which have continued with Me in My temptations.1 He had no mother-lust which could conceive and bring forth sin. In another sense, He is most intimately united with His saints in this sacred conflict; and the same Omnipotent Spirit Who rendered His human nature sinless is given

to redeem our nature from sin. But there is another aspect of temptation which brings Him still nearer to us; and that is, the trial of the spirit from without. This He underwent to the utmost: indeed, as much beyond the possibility of His servants7 temptation as their internal temptation was impossible to Him. To those other and more exterior sources of trial we must now turn our attention

1 Luke 22:28 THE EXTERNAL CONFLICT The regenerate soul, united to Christ, but still in the flesh, is opposed by all the elements of the present world and by the spiritual powers of evil of which Satan is the head: these two are closely united in the general teaching of the New Testament, which represents the temptation of our probationary life as very largely springing from these combined sources I. The WORLD as an element of opposition to the Christian has two distinct meanings, which must be regarded separately

1. The present world, or the state of things into which we are naturally born, and with which we are united through the medium of the body, is not of itself evil; but in a multitude of ways, and through a multitude of channels, presents the materials which the lust of the flesh may convert into temptation. Its innumerable objects may minister to the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life.1 Its necessary occupations may be converted into evil and become the care of this world.2 1 1 John 2:16; 2 Matthew 13:22

2. The world may signify the course of human life as under the order of Providential arrangements: and these, in their infinite diversity, are the elements of probationary trial or temptation. Its joy and prosperity, its adversity and sorrow, are alike tests of the character; making up the conflict of life. This kind of temptation is ordered of God Himself. Hence the same Apostle James who has already described the process of temptation from within exhorts his readers to count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations:1 they are for the trial of your faith.2 1 James 1:2; 2 1 Peter 1:7

3. The world is the present evil world: the course of which is opposed to religion, and the maxims, usages, tendencies, enjoyments, and objects of which are at all points unfriendly to the cultivation of piety. Christ has appeared as the atoning Savior to deliver us from this present evil age,1 by casting out the prince of this world;2 but, during the process of our redemption, our existence in it is a perpetual trial of our Christian graces. The world thus defined, is thus utterly contrary to the religious life, and is under the power of the enemy of Christ’s kingdom 1 Galatians 1:4; 2 John 12:31

II. The solemn doctrine of the Scripture is that the warfare of the Christian life is not only the struggle between the flesh and the Spirit, and the new man and the evil world, but also between the believer in Christ and the vast forces of spiritual intelligences who are leagued, under Satan their head, against the Christian cause in the world. Two Ephesian texts sum up the whole revelation of the New Testament on this subject: indeed the Ephesian Epistle generally may be said to condense into its practical bearing all the teaching of Scripture as to our superhuman foes

1. From the first we learn that there is a conjunction between this class of spiritual enemies and the internal and external opposition which has been described. Ye walked, the Apostle says, according to the course of this world, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience.1 As Jesus by His Spirit directs the course of the regenerate world, so Satan directs the course of the world that now is: whatever in it opposes the Christian life is placed under his control. Here

also he is represented as the interior instigator of that other opposition of the old man and of the flesh: he worketh IN the children of disobedience

1 Ephesians 2:2

2. From the other we learn not to identify these spiritual forces with either the flesh or the world. There is an opposition on the part of our unseen foes which is independent and direct. We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.1 The repeated AGAINST gives equal emphasis to the distinct antagonism of the several orders of fallen spirits, as they are confederate under one head whose directing agency is referred to as the wiles of the devil 1 Ephesians 6:12

3. But the Epistle which thus closes has already set in its forefront the great revelation that Christ is supreme over all the forces of evil. He is set in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.1 Supreme authority over the present course of things, and the supernatural order, is placed in His hands as the Incarnate Head over all things to the Church. And the internal conflict is conducted under His sway, according to the exceeding greatness of His power to us-ward who believe. Thus the proposition laid down again and again is made good, that it is in union with Christ that the universal contest is carried on by the regenerate Christian 1 Ephesians 1:19-22 THE SPECIAL ETHICS OF THIS CONFLICT The ethics of the Christian conflict will now be viewed as comprising the duties and the graces which are strictly connected with it. These may be classified under the two general heads of Preservation, internal and external, and of Confidence in the victorious issue Here we obviously have the defensive and offensive aspects of the whole duty of the servants and soldiers of Christ SELF-PRESERVATION The duties and the graces of the Christian life as withstanding evil can hardly be separated even in thought. They occupy a large place in the New-Testament precepts concerning Self-discipline, and Watchfulness: these terms representing a wide variety of Christian virtues

I. Personal interior discipline takes the lead: that discipline, namely, which negatively prepares for the future conflict, or lessens its force when it is present, or in many cases shields the soul from the conflict altogether. The duties here referred to may be summed up as belonging to the family of Self-denial: the sacred graces and duties and virtues of the Cross

1. At the root of all lies Self-renunciation. This has already been considered in relation to the ultimate end of the soul. Now it is regarded as the fundamental feeling the regenerate must entertain towards the sinful element remaining, which, as the opposite of the new man or the Christ within him, he must needs hate. It passes through many stages in the ethics of the Gospel: the hatred, in principle, with the mortification or crucifixion as the issue; and intermediate acts of self-denial (1.) Our Lord has made the first emphatic; and that in many ways. He has placed it at the very threshold of His service.

If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow Me.1 The first condition of these three is the root of the other two, and not to be confounded with them: the arneesasthoo heauton is an absolute renunciation of all complacency or confidence in self. This ethical principle takes different forms. Its severest is SELF-ABHORRENCE, on which all the

more earnest and deeper ethical teaching of Christianity dwells so much. It is more than hating life in the sense of not loving it so much as Christ. It is the love of God turned in holy enmity against self as an enemy to God; an enemy still so far as any evil remains; and, even if all evil were gone, hated nevertheless in the remembrance of what it was. The Saviour's teaching allows no place for self-complacency, even when the self is sanctified: He taught His servant to say, Not I, but Christ liveth in me!2 This hatred of self sometimes assumes a morbid character in mystical theology; but a close study of the Lord's words will show that it is hard to exaggerate: the inmost secret of religion is not found until the soul literally hates the thought of a self that is independent of God and of Christ: that is, of any SELF at all. Hence the beauty of HUMILITY, the fundamental grace of the Gospel This virtue is many-sided: it has one aspect towards God, another towards man, and another towards self as the subject of past and present sin. This last it is here: profound consciousness of ill-desert before Heaven and impotence against evil. I have heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear: but now mine eye seeth Thee. Wherefore I abhor myself!3 This sublimest expression of humility in the Old Testament illustrates all that has been said: in the presence of the purity of God the soul, conscious of nothing but sin of its own, loathes and abhors itself. It is paralleled by Simon Peter's Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, 0 Lord!4 In this self-distrust, deepened into self-contempt, is the secret of strength. Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God that He may exalt you.5 Submit yourselves therefore to God; Resist the devil:6 each is the counterpart and also the condition of the other. SELF-CRUCIFIXION WITH CHRIST has reference to the entire sinful nature, the flesh with its passions and lusts,7 its passive susceptibility and active impulse. As our Lord condemned sin in the flesh,8 every true disciple must, in spiritual fellowship with Him, do the same. They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh MORTIFICATION has reference to each individual tendency to sin. It is, on the one hand, stronger than that crucifixion: mortify,9 or kill, your members which are upon the earth must mean that in the strength of the Spirit the believer aims habitually at the death of, and does, in fact kill, every form of the life of sin as it emerges. On the other hand, it is less than that crucifixion, which is the destruction of the whole body of sin:10 not that it is utterly destroyed in the one act of crucifixion with Christ, but it is impaled on the interior cross where it must, having no provision11 made for it, die

1 Luke 9:23; 2 Galatians 2:20; 3 Job 42:5-6; 4 Luke 5:8; 5 1 Peter 5:6; 6 James 4:7; 7 Galatians 5:24; 8 Romans 8:3; 9 Colossians 3:5; 10 Romans 6:6; 11 Romans 13:14

(2.) The external practices of a godly asceticism are both the expression and the instrumental aids of this internal discipline. First, and as mediating between inward and outward discipline, comes ABSTINENCE, which is either a grace or a duty: this means in general the non-indulgence of appetite as towards things and affections as towards persons; and may be either only internal or external also. It is the apechein which the ancient moral philosophy so highly extolled. FASTING is then the more express and formal act, brought from the Old Testament by our Lord, Who indirectly enjoined it both by His example and by His precept: when ye fast!1 But this precept leaves the time, character, and degree of fasting to the judgment of him who practices it. Bodily exercise profiteth little:2 this regimen and sacred discipline are acknowledged to be useful. I keep under my body and bring it into subjection3 is a revelation of the Apostle's most earnest selfrestraint in general, which according to his own testimony took the form of express fastings: in fastings often.4 But whatever ascetic practices are adopted must be under the restraint and regulation of one law:

Exercise thyself [RATHER] UNTO GODLINESS.5 1 Matthew 6:16; 2 1 Timothy 4:8; 3 1 Corinthians 9:27; 4 2 Corinthians 11:27; 5 1 Timothy 4:7

(3.) And, as godliness is the design, the warranty, and the safeguard of asceticism, so SELF-GOVERNMENT is its best result. This has been an ethical law in most systems of moral philosophy; but the Christian differs from all others in combining the internal government of the Spirit with this government of self. St. Paul in his final ethical summary shows the combination: The grace of God which bringeth salvation to all men hath appeared, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly:1 the paideuousa is the Divine discipline; the sophronos is the human; and they concur in the perfection which is the Saviour's design. The whole man is the object of this self-government; nothing is excluded, not even the will which itself governs. The law is rigorous as to THOUGHTS, which generally mean the secret motives. These are amenable to control, but not without much discipline: Keep thy heart with all diligence.2 The government of the tongue is still more emphatically prescribed: the tongue being generally the expression of the inward life; particularly the organ of worship to God and the instrument of usefulness to man. St. James has expounded here some of the Lord's most strict sayings: By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.3 If any man offend not in word, the same is a perfectMan 1:4So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty.5 Here WORD AND DEED are combined as another Apostle combines them: whatsoever ye do in word or deed!6 Lastly, all the actions, greater or less, of life are to be ordered in all things and true. Of this St. Paul, the special teacher of self-government, has given in his own example the crowning precept, I therefore so run, not as uncertainly:7 words which, when interpreted by the whole context, show what the minute control of the entire life should be. But SELF-RESIGNATION to the guidance of the Spirit is the secret of all the virtues which belong to the process of the internal transformation. This grace is peculiarly Christian; and is known by many names. As the Spirit is a Teacher and Guide, it is subjection to His will, both passive and active. As He is a Friend, it is the sympathy with His design and yielding to it: Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God.8 Quench not the Spirit.9 While this last may refer rather to the restraint sometimes put upon His extraordinary influence, the former refers to the soul's habitual reverence and awe in the consciousness of an internal Divine monitor. The general and universal duty is: If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit.10 The interior rule of the Holy Ghost is the new secret of Christian ethics: a secret dimly felt after in heathen philosophy, promised in the Old Testament, and fully imparted in the New

1 Titus 2:11-12; 2 Proverbs 4:23; 3 Matthew 12:37; 4 Jas. 3:2 5 James 2:12; 6 Colossians 3:17; 7 1 Corinthians 9:26; 8 Ephesians 4:30. 9 1 Thessalonians 5:19; 10 Galatians 5:25

II. Next come the various graces of self-preservation: as they are summed up in WATCHFULNESS, which implies a perpetual consideration of danger from without; and SOBRIETY, which is the perpetual guard over the state of the soul within. St. Peter unites these most impressively: Be ye therefore sober, and watch unto prayer:1 here the Christian is surrounded by the snares of the passing world; while Be sober, be vigilant, applies the same exhortation in the face of the spiritual adversaries of the soul. His words are only the echo of his Master's: Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.2 Combining these passages of our Lord and the Apostle whose office it was to strengthen his brethren, we have the relation of Watchfulness to the flesh, the world, and the devil. We mark

also that its value as a grace is not only that it prepares for temptation but that it also protects against it. And, finally, when we hear the Redeemer saying, Could ye not watch with Me one hour? we learn that this virtue also is to be practiced in union with Christ, in Whom alone the spirit was willing and the flesh not weak. SELF-EXAMINATION is that general watchfulness exercised at set times; and issuing in self-knowledge and self-distrust, as opposed to careless living and presumption. This duty is enforced by the moralists of every school; it is taught by the light of nature, according to the adage which expresses a universal instinct, KNOW THYSELF. Hence we do not find it expressly enjoined as a practice: it underlies all New- Testament ethics. Some most solemn enforcements of it are in St. Paul's writings. One has reference to the supreme question of an indwelling Savior. Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you? except ye be reprobate.3 Another aims against self-deception in the general business of religion: If a man think himself to be something, when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself.4 But let every man prove his own work. And yet another has reference to the preparation for the Lord's Supper: If we discerned ourselves, we should not be judged:5 self-judgment and the Lord's judgment are alone mentioned, and in a very remarkable conjunction. But the duty of self-examination requires itself to be guarded against morbid self-anatomy, and especially against certain perversions of it under human direction. The supreme safeguard is that it be conducted according to the standard of Scripture, and in the presence of the Searcher of hearts.

God is my witness, Whom I serve with my spirit,6 is St. Paul's example. But there is none more impressive than that of David, in his Psalm of the Omniscient. Examining his life, he could appeal in defense of his integrity to his God: but examining more deeply his heart, he would fain withdraw that appeal The result is the affecting cry: Search me, 0 God, and know my heart; try me and know my thoughts; and see if there be any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way ever-lasting.7 To the earnest Christian who serves God in his spirit, selfexamination must be more or less an habitual state of soul as well as an occasional practice

1 1 Peter 4:7; 2 Matthew 26:40-41; 3 2 Corinthians 13:5; 4 Galatians 6:3-4; 5 1 Corinthians 11:31; 6 Romans 1:9; 7 Psalms 139:23-24 THE VIRTUES OF CONFIDENCE

CONFIDENCE as to the issue of the Christian conflict gives birth to some bright graces, and is the animating principle of many noble virtues. These are some of them active, and some passive, and such as combine both characters

I. What men call COURAGE the New Testament terms Virtue, or apetoo, which St. Peter places first among the graces that Faith inspires. But St. Paul dwells on it still more; it runs indeed through his whole ethical teaching. Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong.1 This quaternion is one of the Apostle's unique passages. Andrizesthe krataiousthe, are a reminiscence of the Old Testament; but in their Christian meaning the former is an injunction to manly and heroic energy, and the latter precept gives the reason of it in the strength which we are supposed to obtain from above. The relation of the believer to an indwelling Savior, Whose Spirit unites His servant to Himself, gives this ethical principle a peculiarity which needs not to be here dilated on. Be strong in the Lord, and in the power of His might,2 says all that requires to be said. I can do all things through Him that strengthened me.3 There is no inbred infection of the flesh, no power of seduction or terror in the world, no malignity of superior beings, that should daunt the Christian

man 1 1 Corinthians 16:13; 2 Ephesians 6:10; 3 Php 4:13

2. Corresponding with this is the grace of PATIENCE, which is indeed linked with it by the term FORTITUDE. It is a passive grace of the entire Christian life, though St. James gives it a work to do: let patience have her perfect work.1 Strictly speaking this virtue has three aspects: one towards the providential appointments of God, which will be hereafter considered as SUBMISSION; another, towards the injuries of men, when it is rather to be called MEEKNESS; and a third, towards the toilsome processes of the Christian life and manifold conflict. It is this we now consider, and must assign it a high place and important function. It secures against impatience with self; and strengthens the soul to persist notwithstanding many failures. It arms the mind with fortitude in the midst of the never-ceasing assaults of the world. And it suffers with magnanimity the manifold onsets of Satan, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished2 in the brethren everywhere

While this grace is most important, it must of course be guarded against the abuses to which its tolerance is liable: it must be combined with a vehement longing for final and eternal freedom from evil. But HOPE is everywhere in Scripture the inspiring grace of the great conflict; being both passive and active. It is a grace that, like Patience, has many aspects. The word itself has a wide range of meanings. Christ is OUR HOPE,3 as the Pillar and Ground of all human expectation through the hope of the Gospel.4 Hope also is one of the theological graces, with Faith and Charity, being a blessed combination of the two others: it is Faith looking only to the future, but looking at it with the confidence of love

Undoubtedly, however, the Christian grace of Hope is most generally connected with the joyful expectation of future victory. Thus the Apostle Paul exhorts to a rejoicing in hope,5 the counterpart of being patient in tribulation. As we have seen it is both active and passive. Every man that hath this hope in Him, purifieth himself:6 his hope in the Supreme Fountain and Pattern of purity animates him to purify his own soul. Putting on the breastplate of faith and love; and for an helmet, the hope of salvation:7 where the helmet is the defense, the passive defense, of the otherwise unprotected head 1 James 1:4; 2 1 Peter 5:9; 3 1 Timothy 1:1; 4 Colossians 1:23; 5 Romans 12:12; 6 1 John 3:3; 7 1 Thessalonians 5:8

3. Lastly, there is a grace which has many names in the New Testament, but not one in particular, and may be characterized as the glorying of the soul in God’s work within it

St. Paul speaks much of exultation in the Lord and the riches of His grace. In one remarkable passage he strips man of all his own boasting: that no flesh should glory in His presence.1 Then after showing what Christ is made to the believer, he adds, that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.2 Here then we have the counterpart of that ethical principle with which this section began, the abhorrence of self. The utter contempt of self apart from God is quite consistent with religious complacency in the operation of God in edifying the new man. This tranquil and rational confidence in the new character sustained by Divine grace the Apostle means when he bids us walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called.3 And the same also when he bids the Philippians think on and do whatsoever things are honest,4 or semna, dignified and decorous. This precept may take the form of CONTEMPT towards sin: not only we are bidden to abhor that which is evil,5 but also to be ashamed of it, and to disdain every vice, great and small. Of some vices, indeed, the Christian moralist speaks as if the very mention of them was

discreditable. The best illustration, however, of this feature in the ethical teaching of the New Testament is the way in which the Apostles refer to the several classes of virtues and vices that belong respectively to the un-regenerate and to the regenerate character. They all and unanimously describe the one as the works of an evil and condemned nature, the other as the product of a Divine and heavenly Spirit

They do not speak of vices as the growth of human nature simply, but as belonging to the flesh, as from below, and as pertaining to the old man which is corrupt and condemned. It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of this ethical principle in the teaching of the New Testament. It is equally impossible to define it exactly: its force must be felt rather than learnt by definition. All the Apostles set in opposite array the virtues and vices: always with a note that the latter are products of a condemned and dying evil habit, and the former the growth of an omnipotent internal energy. St. Paul gives a cardinal instance of what is meant. He calls emphatic attention to his dictum: This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh.6 And then he gives the most complete catalogue of the sins which humanity abhors, and of which it is ashamed. Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: {adultery,} fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, [murders,] drunkenness, revellings, and such like. Here is a confused mass of all lawlessness, against which every law of God and man is set. The very description is, as it were, scornful and contemptuous. There is no sin against God, and the neighbor, and the self, which may not be traced here. They are all works of the flesh. The catalogue includes sin under every aspect, but it is significantly said that they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with its passions and lusts. They are the dying product of an expiring principle. But the fruit of the Spirit is described as the organic result of the tree of life in the soul: love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, self-control. While the sins enumerated are the works of the flesh, active and spontaneous though morally dead, the opposite virtues are the fruit and the work of the eternally Living Spirit. Death cannot resist life. The abominable vices that both begin and end the evil catalogue—as if the career of the flesh was rounded with lust—are opposed by the heavenly virtues of religion. Love leads the army in this war, and self-restraint brings up the rear. Christian character has here its most beautiful description as a band of militant graces, each of which is passive and tranquil. MEEKNESS is our Lord's own special grace: it is humility as passively resisting evil. JOY is a grace which becomes a virtue, and ought to be encouraged as duty. So also PEACE, which here includes the opposite of variance. LONG-SUFFERING, or tolerant bearing of wrong, rising into benignity or GENTLENESS and GOODNESS, which thinks only of getting and diffusing good, lead to general FAITH in GOD and the eternal triumph of goodness, a triumph which is assured. St Peter gives the graces of religion which insure against falling in the contest with sin

DILIGENCE is his general preface and motto; FAITH is the mother grace, as the LOVE by which it works is in St. Paul; the great conflict has for its issue the escaping the corruption that is in the world through lust and being partakers of the Divine nature.7 Here, however, the graces are seven: VIRTUE, or Divine-human energy; KNOWLEDGE; TEMPERANCE; PATIENCE, or submission with hope; GODLINESS; BROTHERLY-KINDNESS; CHARITY. This Apostle also aims to inspire the confidence of which we are now speaking But no encouragement is more emphatic than that of St. James: Wherefore lay apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness,

and receive with meekness the engrafted Word:8 evil is something added that must be put away, leaving nature in its integrity; yet this is not nature, but the engrafted Word. To this must be added his description of the wisdom which descendeth from heaven: as wisdom that is from above contrasted with that which is earthly, sensual, devilish.9

11 Corinthians 1:29; 2 1 Corinthians 1:31; 3 Ephesians 4:1; 4 Php 4:8; 5 Romans 12:9; 6 Galatians 5:16-24; 7 2 Peter 1:4-6; 8 James 1:21; 9 James 3:15; James 3:17 ETHICS OF CHRISTIANSERVICE The service of God bears in Christian ethics a special relation to Christ as our Lord. The duties and graces of this relation are many; and they may be summed up under the several heads of absorbing devotion to the common Master; self-sacrificing zeal for the good of all the objects of His charity for His sake; fidelity to our trust and stewardship in all its branches This extensive department of Christian ethics needs not to be entered upon very fully; as much of it has been already and much will be hereafter introduced under other heads

I. It has been already seen that the Christian religion has this great characteristic, that it makes Jesus, the GOD-MAN, the End of human life. It also makes Him in a special sense the Lord and Master of that life as our sphere of service to Him; and it is with this ethical principle that we now have to do

1. It unites all Christians in one common cause. On the eve of His passion, when our Lord gave a final summary of His will, He asserted His claim in the most affecting manner: Ye call Me Master and Lord, and ye say well; for so IAmos 1:1-15 But this was not a relation of the Apostles alone: they represented the entire Christian fellowship, united to one Teacher and one Lord, through all its orders down to the lowest to whom St. Paul said, Ye serve the Lord Christ.2 The slave to whom he addressed these words is now the Lord's freedman;3 and the estate of slavery, unchristian in itself, served to illustrate that absolute free bondage to Christ which is the glory and the first law of all Christian service 1 John 13:13; 2 Colossians 3:24; 3 1 Corinthians 7:22

2. Hence it absorbs all the actions of life. The duty of the Christian is to do all in the name of the Lord Jesus.1 This is the new, all-pervading, sovereign and blessed law of human probation: penetrating to the minutest detail, and giving to every act a character of reality, dignity, and cheerfulness: Whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men.2 This ethical principle of our religion needs no further illustration. It is the law, written or unwritten, that gathers Christian ethics into unity. Its sanction is clothed with all the terrors of the judgment. And its reward is the supreme approbation of the Lord Himself, Who still says to those who with perfect loyalty and unlimited devotion call Him Lord, Ye say well, I AM:3 kaloos legete eimi gar 1 Colossians 3:17; 2 Colossians 3:23; 3 John 13:13

II. The Christian standard of devotion to the interests of our fellow-creatures is higher than it had ever entered the heart of man, until Christ came, to conceive. It requires all His followers to aspire to the charity of the Lord Himself, and to imitate His example in the self-sacrifice of their life. Outside of Christianity no such standard as this is to be found; though in many ethical systems an unconscious and undirected aspiration to it may be perceived. When our Lord said, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit,1 He spoke of His own glorification through perfect self-sacrifice for man. But in this the servant must be as his Lord; for He added, If any man serve Me let him follow Me.2 And again, after rehearsing in the feetwashing the morrow's great self-sacrifice, He enjoined upon His followers the imitation

both of His spirit and of His act: I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you.3 The law of perfect service is simply and purely the law of SELFSACRIFICE, which in union with the Redeemer and in imitation of Him makes the whole of life a ministration to mankind. But some side-lights are thrown upon this principle that bring it within the range of human possibility and show its consistency with the whole system of Christian ethics. These let us briefly consider 1 John 12:24; 2 John 12:26; 3 John 13:15

1. It is the necessary consequence of union with Christ and consecration to Him. St. Paul prefaces the sublimest exhibition of the supreme self-sacrifice by the words: Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus.1 The text Toúto froneíte en humín hó kaí en Christoó Ieesoú expresses very strongly the thought that the Redeemer's sentiment must needs, if not hindered, fill His servants also: let the supernatural order of grace have its course. At the same time it suggests that this is an ASPIRATION towards a lofty ideal which is not easily attained. In one remarkable passage, however, he goes far to express its attainableness. The love of Christ constraineth us:2 where the sunechei seems like an echo of the Master's passion-words before the Passion, how am I straitened!3 poos sunechomai. It is the sublime feeling which knows no man after the flesh, but which yearns after the salvation of all in the tender mercies of Christ.4 In New-Testament ethics this absolute self-renunciation for mankind is at least the legitimate ideal of the spirit of the Christian's service 1 Php 2:5; 2 2 Corinthians 5:14; 2 Corinthians 5:16; 3 Luke 12:50; 4 Php 1:8

2. It is, however, an ethical standard which may be best studied in connection with the virtues and vices belonging to this domain. The Christian teaching denounces SELFISHNESS in all its forms, pursuing it as it was never pursued before through all its disguises. But here we consider it as an evil that may cling to the Lord's servant. As such it is overcome by the CHARITY which embraces every opportunity of doing good to the bodies and souls of men, and which is called BROTHERLY-KINDNESS if shown towards those of the same religious household. A large part of the very last document of Scripture, St. John's First Epistle, is occupied with the enforcement of this grace, and without making careful distinction between the Christian and the non-Christian objects of it. Here HUMILITY esteems every gift as from God, and thinks soberly of self, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith.1 The SOBRIETY in the spirit of the laborer for Christ may be opposed to all ENVY or jealousy of others and all overvaluation of personal importance: it being implied that the Administrator of gifts does not bestow upon any one more than a small amount. But it is certainly intended to show the necessity of remembering always how transcendently more important the good of others, the edification of the Body, and the salvation of souls, is than the measure of any one person's contribution of effort. He who remembers the boundless work that has to be done in the world, will not think of himself more highly than he ought to think:2 the Apostle who gave the precept was too much absorbed with the grandeur of the charity in which he was engaged to think for a moment about himself at all. INSENSIBILITY to the wants of men, or apathy, or want of zeal, has no place in the Christian heart. St. Paul complains bitterly: I have no man likeminded, who will naturally care for your state

They all seek their own, not the things that are Jesus Christ's.3 The natural instinct of those who are devoted to the Lord leads them to care for all who are His, and for themselves only as included among them. In short, the ethics of the New Testament are always tending, whether they reach it or not, to the point of an entirely disinterested charity, whether as it regards the love of God Himself or the love of the neighbor for God's sake 1 Romans 12:3; 2 Romans 12:3; 3 Php 1:20-21

III. Fidelity is the watchword of another wide department of the ethics of Christian service. It is that grace in the servant which shows him to be worthy of his Master’s trust

Two passages, beginning and ending the New-Testament teaching on the subject, place it in the true light. As to the servant trusted our Lord says: Who then is that faithful and wise steward whom his lord shall make ruler over his household? Blessed is that servant!1 The servant is a dulos, and the steward is an oikonomos. St. Paul gives the description of the faithful servant as showing all good fidelity:2 pistin pasan agatheen The same word pistis which expresses our trust in God’s fidelity expresses His trust in ours. It is a grace which stands alone as having the epithet good, and it must pervade the whole of life. The verb which mediates between faithful and fidelity is found in St. Paul’s words concerning his stewardship of the Gospel, but may be universally applied oikonomian pepisteumai, a dispensation is committed unto me, or I have been trusted with a stewardship.3 Here then are all the elements of our ethics: the Master commits a trust, and the trustworthy servant shows fidelity in all things. It may be added that the very faith which trusts God is the strength of the faithfulness which God may trust. We have now to trace the applications of this principle, giving under each a few examples that represent many. No ethical principle is more pervasive 1 Luke 12:42-43; 2 Titus 2:10; 3 1 Corinthians 9:17

1. Christ’s servant holds his own person in trust, For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body,1 as the instrument of His service alone. We are specially the property of Christ: whether we live therefore or die, we are the Lord’s.2 The CARE OF SELF is part of our stewardship as we are entrusted with our own persons. On this is to be based the duty of preserving health, training the body to its utmost efficiency, cultivating every faculty of the mind, and keeping the whole man in the highest possible vigor: ready for every good work, and meet for the Master’s use.3 St. Paul inculcates on Timothy a due solicitude both for spiritual and for bodily health: as to the former, Keep thyself pure4 is a general principle; and as to the latter, Drink no longer water5 may be quoted as a significant hint. Perhaps there are few applications of the principle of fidelity which are more neglected than this. Every one of us is put in charge with his spirit, and soul, and body, to educate them to the highest pitch of service for the longest possible time, and in the most perfect possible vigor 1 1 Corinthians 6:20; 2 Romans 14:8; 3 2 Timothy 2:21; 4 1 Timothy 5:22; 5 1 Timothy 5:23 2. Fidelity extends to the whole of life, with special reference to our individual vocation

Nothing is excluded from the sphere of this duty. The whole compass of life must be governed by it, and the true Christian is, what St. Paul exhorts the wives of deacons to be, faithful in all things.1 They are the faithful,2 hoi pistoi, as being believers: one word embraces both meanings. Their final seal is that of being called, and chosen, and faithful.3 But the duty is very generally connected with the special vocation. The difference here marked is shown in two parables of our Lord which are the key to all His many parables on this subject. In the one He called His ten servants and delivered them ten pounds, and said unto them, Occupy till I come.4 All His servants have one common gift of life to profit withal. In the other, unto one He gave five talents, to another two, and to another one; to every man according to his several ability.5 In both the reckoning is strict; both the equal pounds and the unequal talents are specially entrusted; they show in a certain sense that all servants have a special vocation; and yet they seem to note a difference between what is common to all and what is proper to each. With regard to special ministries and vocations, St. Paul says, it is required in stewards that a man be found faithful;6 of himself he testifies that Christ

Jesus counted me trustworthy, putting me into the ministry.7 Of this fidelity our Lord Himself is the supreme pattern: Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly vocation, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our confession, [Christ] Jesus, as being faithful to Him that appointed Him.8 But this glorious example blends again special vocation with the general calling of life; for we all must be looking unto Jesus the Author and Finisher of the Faith,9 and of fidelity to the Faith. "We reach the same conclusion when we recall how constant is the reference to fidelity in the use of special opportunities and faculties of usefulness: especially that which the possession of earthly goods affords. Here the virtue of PRUDENCE, or economical wisdom, is allied with fidelity: Who then is that faithful and wise steward?10 The parable of the Unjust Steward, apart from its more general meaning, stamps this precept with deep impressiveness. Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness. He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much. No servant can serve two masters.11 In these last words we have the Christian Lawgiver's law of fidelity in its highest principle and its lowest application. It is the supreme reference of all things to one Master and one service; and it is the prudent and faithful observance of that law in the most sedulous and scrupulous care of the least trifles of life

1 1 Timothy 3:11; 2 Acts 10:45; 3 Revelation 17:14; 4 Luke 19:13; 5 Matthew 25:15; 6 1 Corinthians 4:2; 7 1 Timothy 1:12; 8 Hebrews 3:1-2; 9 Hebrews 12:2; 10 Luke 12:42; 11 Luke 16:9-10; Luke 16:13

3. Fidelity, as the test applied to service, is guarded by threatenings and stimulated by the hope of reward. It is a duty as well as a virtue; nor is there any obligation in ethics which is more closely bound up with human responsibility

(1.) It is not necessary here to dwell on the nature of the punishment reserved for unfaithfulness: we have to do only with the character stamped on it by our Lord. He uses three terms which give this department of ethics an awful solemnity. Thou WICKED and SLOTHFUL servant! Cast ye the UNPROFITABLE servant into outer darkness.1 Wicked in his heart, slothful in His Master's business, and unprofitable both to himself and to his Lord! The weeping and gnashing of teeth fearfully indicate that the penalty is an abiding regret which is no other than hopeless remorse. The only mitigation is the proportion of the doom; But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required.2 It must never be forgotten that the far larger part of the references to the final judgment make it the test of servant-fidelity: at least in the case of Christian believers 1 Matthew 25:26-30; 2 Luke 12:48

(2.) The rewards promised to Fidelity are represented in many lights. It brings its own recompense in the Master's approval, who does not wait for the end to say Well done, good and faithful servant! That will be the crowning blessedness of a persistent fidelity: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.1 As unfaithfulness is followed by a withdrawal of the trust, so fidelity increases it: thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things.2 Faithful stewardship in probation leads to a stewardship whose probation will have ceased for ever. But another element of the reward brings it back to the present life. Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of My Father I have made known unto you.3 They who enter hereafter into the Lord's joy enter now into His secrets and confidence. Their service is the service of friendship; while their friendship is the

friendship of servants. Here is the inmost secret of our ethics of service, which once more bases them on union with Christ. It is this lastly, which explains how the reward is reckoned of grace. While we must say: We are unprofitable servants;4 we have done that which was our duty to do,5 He, in His boundless grace, will say the opposite of this. Forgiving the neglect of our service, and not remembering in how many instances we have not done the things which are commanded, He will reckon to all our poor fidelity the virtue of His own faithfulness, and we shall receive a full reward,6 misthon pleeree 1 Matthew 25:23; 2 Matthew 25:21; 3 John 15:15; 4 Romans 4:4; 5 Luke 17:10; 6 2 John 1:8 ETHICS OFGODLINESS The last department of specially Christian ethics, the issue and consummation of all the rest, pervading all and crowning all, comprises the duties, virtues, and graces that have GOD alone for their Object. These may be summed up in the one word Piety or Godliness; which is the Christian character based upon Entire Consecration, is expressed in the Worship of praise and prayer, and issues in Union with God CONSECRATION TO GOD

Personal Consecration to God is the entire oblation of Self to the Giver and Redeemer of our being according to the terms of the covenant of grace. This principle of Selfsurrender is evidenced by universal submission of the heart and life: by devotion to the will of God as expressed either in His commandments or in His providential appointments; that is, in active Obedience and in passive Submission. A life thus governed tends in all things to God; the character thus formed is a godly character; and the habit of the soul is that of eusebeia or godliness. We have seen the fundamental principles of this entire self-surrender under the doctrine of Sanctification. It is necessary here only to make some observations on its ethical bearing

1. It is the beginning, the strength, and the consummation of all religion as the human service of God. As man’s act it is negative and positive. It is the absolute renunciation of proprietorship in self: Whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be My disciple.1 Know ye not that.... ye are not your own? for ye are bought with a price.2 It is the absolute surrender of the whole being to God: Yield yourselves unto God.3 This self-surrender is to be made in the strength of the grace of redemption, the salvation of the Gospel being its argument and its strength: I beseech you therefore by the mercies of God that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service.4 These words sum up the whole doctrine. Religion, or godliness, is the habitual, conscious, never interrupted, offering up of the spirit, soul and body, to the service of the Living God in the entire activity of life: the self surrendering self 1 Luke 14:33; 2 1 Corinthians 6:19-20; 3 Romans 6:13; 4 Romans 12:1

2. This consecration is unto universal Submission, which is active and passive. As active it is the devotion of the heart to the performance of all the commandments of God as they constitute His one will: this is Obedience, the first and all-embracing duty of the creature towards the Creator as Moral Governor: an obligation expressed in many ways throughout the two Testaments, and literally absolute, being the foundation alike of the Law and of the Gospel, which is itself the announcement of the new obedience of faith.1 As passive it is the duty and grace of entire Self-abandonment to all the appointments of Divine providence either as they are afflictive or as they are inscrutable; in the former case, it is RESIGNATION; in the latter it is this conjoined with Acquiescence, or silent submission to the will of God

1 Romans 16:26

WORSHIP The worship of God is the highest expression of the religious spirit, offering to God the creature's tribute in Praise, or uttering the creature's need in Prayer. These may be regarded as distinct and as united in the spirit and habit of devotion

I. Many terms have been sanctified in the language of religious mankind to express the highest tribute of the human spirit to the Supreme. In Holy Scripture these terms are varied, expressing the sentiment of Reverence whence all worship springs; the act of Adoration which silently and Praise which audibly extols the Divine Name and Perfections; and Thanksgiving which expresses gratitude for the mercies of God

1. REVERENCE is the supreme and eternal duty and grace of .the created spirit. It is both the source and the issue of all godliness. The three passages, Holy and reverend is His name!1 Hallowed be Thy Name!2 Sanctify the Lord Christ in your hearts!3 in their combination teach us first how awful is God in Himself, then that the coming of His kingdom is the universal acknowledgment of His majesty, and finally that this reverence must be the inmost sentiment of our individual hearts. Reverence is fear tempered by love. In the Old Testament the fear predominated, in the New Testament the love; but the sentiment of reverence pervades all religion on earth and in heaven. Whether as sacred dread or loving fear, it abideth always. As the spirit formed by religion it is universal in its influence. It is the habitual sense of the Presence of God that gives dignity to life, and makes the character of him who cultivates it venerable. It extends to all Divine things as well as to the Name of God Himself: to His Word, to His ordinances, to His created temple of the world, and to all that is His. In His Presence more particularly it is

AWE 1 Psalms 91:9; 2 Matthew 6:9; 3 1 Peter 3:15

2. PRAISE proper is in Scriptural language either Adoration or Blessing. Adoration, as the word indicates (from Os the mouth) is the prostration which as it were kisses the earth at the Divine feet. It stands for every act in which the spirit of reverence expresses itself The Hebrew term yishtach is sometimes used, like the Greek proskuneesai, to indicate homage before the creature. But the closing words of the New Testament show its highest and only true application: refusing the Apostle's lower prostration the angel said: worship God.1 But the prostrate mouth speaks in Blessing and Praise. Hallelujah! Praise ye the Lord!2 is in both Testaments the most exulting of all notes. The Hebrew baareek, to bless, is often translated by praise.3 This term, however, like adoration, has a human as well as a Divine application. Moreover, it is wide in its range. In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed:4 this is the Benediction of God to man, which becomes in another passage shall bless themselves,5 or shall rejoice before God. Again, daily shall He be blessed 6(or praised) is the return of benediction to Heaven. But here it is observable that Christ is, in the unity of the Father, the object of this supreme praise. The term Blessed, or eulogeetos, is used in the New Testament only of God and of Christ. The Son of the Blessed7 is Himself God blessed for ever.8 Other Scriptural terms might be mentioned, variations on these words and having reference to the forms of praise in public worship; but these we need not discuss in particular. Christian individual devotion employs a variety of expressions which are not necessarily derived from Scripture; and it is an important principle of reverence that these should be always reserved exclusively for their highest uses. To sum up all: the devout spirit offers to God the ADORATION of a creature, the HOMAGE of a subject or servant, the PRAISE of a worshipper

1 Revelation 22:9; 2 Psalms 150:1-6; 1; 3 Revelation 19:1; 4 Genesis 12:3; 5 Genesis 22:18; 6 Psalms 72:15; 7 Mark 14:61; 8 Rom. Romans 9:5

3. THANKSGIVING is a duty of which GRATITUDE is the grace. This obligation of godliness is acknowledged by the universal sentiment of mankind; but as a Christian grace it has some blessed peculiarities. It is gratitude, as for all the benefits of Divine providence, so especially for the general and personal gifts of redemption. The very term most in use shows this; it is charis, which is the Grace of God in Christ, operating in the soul of the believer as a principle, and going back to Him in gratitude: Thanks be unto God for His unspeakable gift.1 The ethical gratitude of Christianity connects every good gift and every perfect gift with the Gift of Christ. Moreover, it is a thanksgiving which in the Christian economy, and in it alone, redounds to God for all things: in everything give thanks.2 This characteristic flows from the former. The rejoicing which we have in the Lord, and the everlasting consolation we possess in Him, makes every possible variety of Divine dispensation a token for good. The Christian privilege is to find reason for gratitude in all things: for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning you 1 2 Corinthians 9:15; 2 1 Thessalonians 5:18

II. PRAYER is, like brotherly love, a duty in the obligations of which all men are, as it were, naturally theodidakoi, taught of God.1 It is the expression of man's dependence upon God for all things. Its general grounds have been discussed already, and will be considered more fully under the Means of Grace: it is here viewed only as belonging to the ethics of the Christian character, in its spirit and in its acts 1 1 Thessalonians 4:9 1. What habitual reverence is to praise, the habitual sense of dependence is to prayer

Nothing less than this is signified in the injunctions that men ought always to pray,1 and pray without ceasing:2 if the former refers rather to the importunity of request, the latter inculcates the duty of evermore, consciously or unconsciously, waiting upon God. Both are united in the words: praying always with all prayer and supplication.3 More particularly the spirit of prayer depends upon three elements: First, the inwrought habit of mentally connecting with every action of life the Supreme, for in Him we live, and move, and have our being;4 secondly, the abiding consciousness of dependence on the Mediator through Whose constant advocacy our spiritual life is sustained; and, lastly, the presence of the Spirit of adoption in our hearts, Who maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.5 Here is the deep secret of the spirit of prayer. He that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, that He maketh intercession for the saints according to God.6 The froneemaa tou pneumatos is according to God what the carnal mind, froneema tou sarkos, is according to fallen nature: the habitual movement of the unspoken impulse. The Spirit's groaning intercession within the veil of the heart answers exactly to the intercession of the High Priest within the veil of heaven; and both are without interval or rest. Hence the duty of PERSEVERANCE in devotion refers to insistency in particular requests and the continuing instant in prayer:7 instant for the former, continuing for the latter. To combine these two is perfection 1 Luke 18:1; 2 1 Thessalonians 5:17; 3 Ephesians 6:18; 4 Acts 17:28; 5 Romans 8:26-27; 6 Romans 8:7; 7 Romans 12:12

2. The formal acts of prayer are manifold, expressed by a number of terms common to both Testaments, and combining the spirit and the act. The leading word proseuchee is one of those. It is always prayer to God, and that without limitation. When St. Paul exhorts, in everything by prayer

and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God,1 he distinguishes from this general PRAYER the deeesei, or SUPPLICATION for individual benefits. It is the difference between prayer and petition. The REQUESTS of the supplication, aiteemata, simply express the individuality of the prayer: the supplication noting our need (dei), and the request the utterance of that need. When our Savior said, In that day ye shall ask Me nothing, He used another term signifying, in the case of the disciples, the interrogation of perplexity: there it is erotan, which is changed for aiten in what follows: Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in My name, He will give it you.2 The former word is used of our Lord's own prayer, never the latter: hence the former has in it more of familiarity, and is never used of human prayer. Save, indeed, in one passage, which leads us to the prayer of INTERCESSION. St. John changes aiteesei into erooteesee concerning the sin unto death, I do not say that he shall pray for it:3 we may ask in confidence concerning every other sin, but concerning this we are to leave the erotan to Christ. Intercessory prayer has no term to express our precise idea of it. The exhortation is generally to supplication for all saints,4 and for all men,5 after the example of the Lord's intercession. In the passage to Timothy St. Paul uses for once the word enteuxeis, intercessions, which however means familiar and confident prayers, as coming from the word entugchanein, literally to fall in with a person and enter into familiar speech with him. In the strength of Christ's intercession we also are commanded to intercede, or to speak confidently with God on behalf of others: save indeed with the one reservation mentioned above. Intercessory prayer must blend with all our supplications; as our Lord teaches in the solitary command which He gives concerning private prayer, enter into thy closet, when the Father Which seeth in secret is to be addressed as Our Father!6 and the individual supplication not lost in but blended with the common prayer. When thou hast shut thy door is the Mediator's solemn injunction of formal, habitual, regular private exercises of devotion: confirming the injunctions and examples of all Scripture. But the devout soul everywhere can shut the doors of the senses, and sink into the presence of God: there worshipping with all the effect of local seclusion, and by EJACULATORY prayer holding habitual communion with Him who makes the heart of the regenerate His temple 1 Php 4:6; 2 John 16:23; 3 1 John 5:16; 4 Ephesians 6:18; 5 1 Timothy 2:1; 6 Matthew 6:6; Matthew 6:9 III. The perfection of these supreme offices of devotion is seen only in their combination

United they constitute Worship, as it respects God; as it respects man, the spirit of devotion; and in their effect upon the religious life one constantly reacts upon the other to the gradual perfection of both

1. Divine worship as the highest offices of religion embraces both elements: the presentation to God of His tribute, and the supplication of His benefits. In the first and only description of that worship which our Lord Himself gave, contained in His conversation with the woman of Samaria, He used again and again the one and only word prosekuneesan to express the whole service of God: pre-eminently adoration, but including all the sebasmata or devotions1 of the worshipper, as St. Paul in a solitary passage terms them. Hence the full meaning of the phrase COMMUNION WITH GOD,2 as both giving and receiving. The word Hosanna, which enters the New Testament from the Old, combines prayer and praise: Hosanna [save now!] to the Son of David. Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord!3 1 Acts 17:23; 2 Php 4:15; 3 Matthew 21:9

2. The spirit of devotion in the worshipper is blended of praise and prayer. Those are to a great extent indistinguishable. The devotional language of Scripture strikingly illustrates this. To seek the

Lord in prayer and to wait upon Him in reverent silence seem to mean the same thing. The Lord is good unto them that wait for Him, to the soul that seeketh Him:1 the active seeking must be accompanied and qualified by the passive waiting

Although there are few positive precepts on the subject, it is obviously the tendency of revealed religion from beginning to end to inculcate a service which blends contemplation and the meditative habit with all prayer.

Let the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart be acceptable in Thy sight!2 MEDITATION is the silent pondering of the soul on Divine things through the medium of the Word, the devout consideration of some particular truth, or revelation, or promise: as preceding, accompanying, and following all prayer it is the strength and best grace of devotion. CONTEMPLATION is the same posture of the devout mind, but with some exclusive reference to God Himself. It expresses the highest aim of the soul to behold the Supreme in anticipation of the eternal Vision, In the devotional ethics of Mysticism the differences of the two stages of meditation and contemplation are much dwelt upon; and the latter is regarded as the final goal of all devotion: the state of detachment from every creature and the pure beholding of God alone as the only Being. Nor does Scripture discourage this sacred ambition; its safeguard, however, is this, that all contemplation be combined with prayer. The error of false Mysticism is to believe that the soul may be raised into a state in which every affection of the heart is stilled and all emotion lost in the fixed and unchangeable vision of Him in Whom all desire of personal blessedness is forgotten 1 Lamentations 3:25; 2 Psalms 19:14

UNION WITH GOD As the consummation of all ethical duties is the worship of God, so the end of all worship is union with Him. To this most glorious issue all the revelations of Scripture converge. It is the end of all teaching and the seal of all perfection. Our Lord’s Prayer for His people makes this the goal of Christian aspiration: that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us.1 But the union with God is, like all other relations to the Supreme, attained only in and through the Mediator: I in them and Thou, in Me, that they may be made perfect in one.2 A few observations on this their supreme end and aim may close the department of personal ethics, whether of duties or of graces 1 John 17:21; 2 John 17:23

1. Union with God is the realization of the one object of the redeeming economy. It is the perfect and diametrical opposite of sin, which is in its essence separation from the supreme centre of spiritual life. Sin is the violation of duty, the absence of virtue, the loss of the summum Bonum of blessedness: nothing less than union with God is the perfect restoration to duty, and the consummation of virtue, and the supremest and fullest blessedness. Any view of Christian morality which carries its vision to any point short of this is of necessity defective

2. An unhealthy dread of Mysticism has hindered the appreciation of this truth. Union with God has undoubtedly been the watchword of some of the sublimest systems of ethics based on erroneous doctrine. Buddhism in the East and Pantheistic Mysticism in the West are instances: so far as personal ethics are concerned Christianity can find no fault in them but that of deep defect. But their end was not as their beginning. They issued both in the deepest darkness of error: in the East it was the abyss of absolute extinction or Nirvana, and in the West the worse abyss of Antinomian indifference to moral distinctions. But the Union of which we speak is one that preserves inviolate the personal identity of him who attains it: he becomes ONE WITH GOD in thought and feeling

and will: the emphasis being laid on the WILL

3. But our Lord's words dwell on that unity with the Supreme Source of life which is to be enjoyed by a corporate fellowship of saints. It cannot be too deeply pondered that the last and highest words, whether of our Lord or of His Apostles St. Paul and St. John, speak of a Body one in the fellowship of the Holy Trinity, and so one that the individual, though not lost, is never again remembered as such, This carries us forward to the next Section

RELATIVE ETHICS The ethics of our relations to our fellow-creatures are inseparably bound up with the ethics of personal character. But they may also be viewed as entirely distinct: or rather as prescribing the obligations of duty in more direct relation to others. First, there are obligations arising out of the common and mutual relations of man and man. Secondly, there are those which are based upon the sacred and necessary relations of domestic society. Thirdly, there are those which are connected with the voluntary or accidental relations of men in social life, and the Divine ordinance of commerce. Fourthly, though under some reserve and restriction, we must include political ethics. Fifthly and lastly, there are the ethics of our higher relation to the society and fellowship of the kingdom of God. Upon all these Christianity pours a clear and steady and sufficient light: gathering up all former teaching, and impressing the whole with the seal of perfection ETHICS OF MAN AND MAN

All men are related as fellows or neighbors. Obligations to universal man as such may be classed under five heads as the duties of Charity, of Justice, of Truth, of Purity, of Honor: each of these, with its subordinates, being marked out in Holy Scripture emphatically and distinctly. There is, however, a sense in which all are summed up in the first; again the remaining three may be regarded as one in the second: thus making Love and Justice preeminent in the relations of man to his fellow, as they are in his supreme relations to God

CHARITY

Much has been already said of CHARITY, which in the New-Testament is reserved for man's widest obligation to his neighbor: it is the one term which is common to heaven and earth in this sense. It is more than the limited love of the brethren which in us answers to God's favor to His own: St. Peter, as we have seen, makes the distinction very clear, and to brotherly kindness, charity.1 This noblest of all the graces belongs by prescriptive right to all departments of ethics. As appointed to regulate the universal relations of mankind, it has a very wide family of virtues under it, which may be subdivided as in a certain sense active and passive, or, rather, positive and negative

1 2 Peter 1:7

1. It is PHILANTHROPY in the conventional use of the word to signify practical care for the wellbeing of the race which knows no limits, but extends, whether as Benevolence or Beneficence, to man as such. The word philanthroopia,1 however, is used only of God; it is not used expressly even of the God-man, though the only passage in which it occurs attributes this sentiment to GOD OUR SAVIOUR. KINDNESS is natural regard to our kind; therefore not employed to denote the Divine regard, for which the word is Lovingkindness, though this is extended to all the works of the Divine hand. Charity or love, as the duty which every man owes to his fellow-man, presides over a wide range of obligations, from the supreme SELF-SACRIFICE which is ready to lay down our

lives2 in imitation of Him who laid down His life for us, down to the gentlest act of COURTESY which sheds its charm upon common life, blending love and justice into one 1 Titus 3:4; 2 1 John 2:16

2. But its most impressive exhibitions are such as are called forth in imitation of the Divine charity. Such is MERCY: strictly, speaking, God alone can be merciful; but in the same sense as man may sin against man he is bound to be merciful to the offender, and to forgive him if need be seven times in a day.1 And more than that; for, when reminded of His words by Peter, the Redeemer said: I say not unto thee, until seven times; but, until seventy times seven.2 Longsuffering belongs to God alone: we, following the Divine example, are required to practice FORBEARANCE, which is the disposition not to press to the uttermost our claims against a fellow-creature. This is by our Lord called COMPASSION, and PITY, and FORGIVENESS. Shouldst not thou also have had compassion on thy fellow-servant even as I had pity on thee?3 All these affections towards universal man are required of those who bear the Divine image as restored in Christ. Throughout the New Testament this unlimited charity, meditating the most unbounded kindness and capable of the most unbounded forbearance, is inculcated as a grace taught of God to those who in union with Christ partake of His Spirit. Our Lord denounces the vice that seems to honor love while it robs it of its perfection as absolutely universal. Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies4 . . . Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect. St. John, in his last Epistle, the supplement and complement of all Scripture, gives this its strongest expression. He, like all the writers of the New Testament, but more directly than any other, makes the charity of redemption the standard of universal duty

Hereby perceive we Love, because He laid down His life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.5 Not for the brethren only, however: these words must be conformed to the precept of the Savior, who commends to us the perfection of the Father’s impartial love as our standard. And, if the love of God in the Atonement is made the example, it is also made the source of our strength to copy it: If we love one another, GOD DWELLETH IN US, AND HIS LOVE IS PERFECTED IN US. Hereby know we that we dwell in Him, and He in us, because HE HATH GIVEN US OF HIS SPIRIT.6 1 Luke 17:4; 2 Matthew 18:22; 3 Matthew 18:33; 4 Matthew 5:43; Matthew 5:48; 5 1 John 3:16; 6 1 John 4:12-13

JUSTICE

JUSTICE, as co-ordinate with Love in the ethics of man’s relation to man, is the principle of respect for the rights of others. Like charity, it is a virtue of which God gives the highest standard in His acts. But here there is a difference. The retributive justice which belongs to God, Who alone can distribute rewards and punishments, may be reflected in the justice of human judicial courts where law is administered. But the virtue that honors the infinite variety of mutual human rights is righteousness in the phraseology of Scripture, which however uses both righteous and just as adjectives. It is the paying universally what we owe. St. Paul explains this, and, at the same time, shows the profound connection between love and justice, when he says;

Owe no man anything, but to love one another; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law.1 Here love is the eternal debt of righteousness, which justice must be for ever paying. Now Charity, as we have seen, does not suppress righteousness either in God or in man: in us it is the strength

by which the debt is paid as well as the watchful registrar of the debt itself. The Christian ethics of justice are deeply affected by the supremacy of love; as will be seen by considering the various forms of justice as they are presented in the New Testament

1 Romans 8:8

1. Justice recognizes in every member of the human family certain inalienable rights that belong to man as created in the image of God and redeemed by the incarnation of His Son. The precept Honor all men1 occurs in a connection which shows that the inheritor of human nature as such is to be respected. Every man is in a certain sense a brother of Jesus; and, loved as such, must receive the tribute which is essentially his due. Closely connected with this is the indestructible right, subject to certain restrictions which do not touch the right itself, to the control of himself: in other words that freedom of will which is personal liberty. It is injustice to despise any man as such, to whatever degradation he may have sunk in his race: here at the one extreme, justice must give freedom to every slave, and hold slavery in abhorrence, and, at the other, must be courteous.2 The perfection of COURTESY is to give to everyone on all occasions his human due, as interpreted by love: while to those of high degree it is reverence, and to the lowly is condescension, it is to all alike the honor due to man as man, and especially to the weaker and more honorable sex. Like Hospitality, which is courtesy not so much in spirit and in word as in act, this is a grace too often unrecognized and unvalued 1 1 Peter 2:17; 2 1 Peter 3:8

2. There is another class of rights which are not inherent in all, but earned by the moral industry and fidelity of our neighbors; those which are based upon acquired character

Every man's reputation is dear to him: whether it be his general good fame or his particular repute. Justice guards both as the right of our fellow-men; and, reinforced by love, more than guards them. It abhors Slander, which, by backbiting, scandal-mongery, or innuendo, would rob another of his character; and Detraction, which would rob him of his fair repute. The law of justice says: Render therefore to all their dues.1 Love had in the preceding chapter gently corrected this: in honor preferring one another.2 1 Romans 13:7; 2 Romans 12:10

3. Justice respects the rights of property in general. If Christianity introduces any modification here it is not as it respects our relation to the holder of property, but the relation of the holder of property to God. He holds it only in trust, and as a steward; and obligations arise of a personal character which have already been referred to. Relative morals, however, are independent of this; and require that we rigidly observe the laws of what in modern language is called HONESTY

4. Reserving this for the ethics of commerce, we may refer to another range of application. All men have a right to our fidelity to TRUTH. Society is based on this principle. Justice, attended by love, mast be SINCERE in the intention of the present moment; mast be true, in the sense of VERACIOUS, in spoken words referring to the past; and must be FAITHFUL to every engagement concerning the future. All these virtues belong more or less, as we have seen, to personal and interior ethics; but they enter here also. Our neighbor has no claim, no right, more imperative than that which expects truth from us. Christianity heightens the claim by showing that we belong to a corporate body, the union of which depends upon the fidelity of each to other. Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbor: for we are members one of another.1 Similarly, the vice or injustice of stealing is condemned: Let him that stole steal no more: but rather

let him labor, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth. Here the interpretation of love comes in. It is not enough to abstain from robbing another; the opposite virtue must be practiced, the giving to those who need instead of taking from those who have 1 Ephesians 4:25; Ephesians 4:28

5. Finally, the law of love, blending its influence with that of justice, introduces a variety of ethical sentiments of great importance. It is our obligation to respect and to our utmost ability to preserve the purity of others by a pure demeanor towards them: this duty of justice interpreted by love is elevated into a perpetual law of life. The question in Christian ethics is not, What does my neighbor expect from me? but what ought he to expect? and, what ought I to do for him whether he expects it or not? Both love and justice lie at the foundation of our Lord's precept: All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; FOR THIS is THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS.1

1 Matthew 7:12 ETHICS OF FAMILY LIFE The Family relation is the ordinance of God lying at the foundation of all human society

Christian Ethics leave nothing wanting here as it respects the main elements of that ordinance: the relation of Marriage, that of Parents and Children, that of Masters and Servants, and the regulation of the Household generally as the home of all

MARRIAGE

Christianity confirms, simplifies, and vindicates from abuse the original and sacred ordinance of marriage. Moreover it elevates and hallows it afresh by special benedictions

I. The original appointment of MONOGAMY IS confirmed: From the beginning of the creation God made them male and female. For this cause shall a man leave father and mother and shall cleave to his wife1 . . .. What therefore God hath joined together let not man put asunder.2 Our Lord in these words gives us the sum of His decisions on this question, with all the principles the ethics of which must regulate marriage both as a religious and as a civil institution. From these principles there should be no appeal 1 Mark 10:6-8; 2 Matthew 19:6

1. Everything like Gnostic or Manichaean dishonor of this state of life is contrary to the spirit of the Christian legislation. Whatever disparagement of marriage may be found in any part of the New Testament is to be interpreted in harmony with this original ordinance of the Creator, as the Savior, creating all things new, has confirmed it. He Himself may seem to have occasionally set it aside, as when He spoke of those which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. The utmost that may be inferred from this is, that the ordinance was not made binding on every member of the race; and that either devotion or discretion may find it expedient to renounce or defer the marriage bond with its responsibilities. St. Paul illustrates this, both by example and by precept. He teaches the dignity and the sanctity of wedded life; and his suggestions of entire abstinence were given only for the present distress.1 1 1 Corinthians 7:26

2. MONOGAMY was as an institution made for man, like the Sabbath, and not man made for it. Although there is no express decree on the subject in the Scriptures, it may be fairly assumed that the original union of Adam and Eve was the type of the union of male and female among their descendants; especially as there is a general equality in their numbers. But no reason can be

assigned why the Supreme Lawgiver might not in some cases sanction the suspension or the occasional change of the law. Hence the commanded, permitted, or uncondemned concubinage of some of the ancient servants of God. Undoubtedly, the current of the Old Testament shows that monogamy was the normal appointment; and in the New Testament our Lord has finally confirmed this When St. Paul says that a bishop must be the husband of one wife1 he seems, but only seems, to tolerate polygamy in private Christians. We have here an alternative exposition

Either the Apostle teaches that the rule of one wife—not yet absolutely pressed upon all men, any more than the manumission of slaves—was peremptory for the bishop; or he prescribes that the bishop must never replace the wife whom he may have lost. There is something anomalous in each side of the alternative. But both interpretations are consistent with the principles that a man should be the husband of only one wife

1 1 Timothy 3:2

II. In the Old Testament marriage is often used to symbolize the relation between God and His people; and in the New Testament this is more emphatically the case. St. Paul, himself not a married man and the only Apostle who has been supposed to depreciate the institution, elevates it into a standing type of the union between Christ and His people, both collective and individual. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the Church. This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the Church.1 Here it is the union between the Lord and the mystical Body which is in the Old Testament the Queen,2 and in the New the Bride and the Lamb's wife.3 But in another passage we hear: he that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit: the allusion to one flesh4 in the preceding verse makes it very plain that the personal union with Christ is in the Apostle's thoughts 1 Ephesians 5:28-32; 2 Psalms 45:9; 3 Revelation 21:9; 4 1 Corinthians 6:17

1. But, apart from the mystical fellowship which it illustrates, no higher tribute to marriage is conceivable than this. It carries the dignity and sanctity of the marriage relation to the highest point short of making it a sacrament. It is the most intimate and sacred union conceivable; the mutual complement necessary to the perfection of man and woman, and one which cannot be supposed to subsist with more than one person. As an institution for continuing the human race it is as pure in its own sphere as that Union between the Bridegroom and the Bride to which the spiritual increase of the Church itself is due. This sheds a strong light upon the various kinds of dishonor done to the ordinance The violations of ethical obligation refer to the two final causes of marriage. First, in all those tempers and acts which interfere between the persons to impair the perfection of their unity, Christ's union with the Church being always in view: Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord; for the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the Head of the Church . . .. Husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church.1 Here there is much to ponder. The inmost grace of the wife as such is the love of submission: the earthly reflection of that loyal homage of devotion which the man was commanded to offer: He is thy Lord; and worship thou Him!2 The inmost grace of the husband is perfect self-sacrificing love. The two are one; and their union is sacred. Their communion, therefore, down to the slightest offices of affection, must be pure. Thence arise interior ethics which need not to be dwelt upon; a hint of which, however, St. Paul gives when he says: Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time . . . that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency.3 This leads to the other

class of offences: the sinful indulgence of those lusts which war against the second primary purpose of marriage: ADULTERY, with all the train of vices that precede, accompany, and follow it 1 Ephesians 5:22; Ephesians 5:25; 2 Psalms 45:11; 3 1 Corinthians 7:5

2. As it respects DIVORCE, the Christian law cannot be understood without reference to the Mosaic legislation, which it generally comprises. Our Lord makes very express reference to the matter: correcting ancient traditional errors on this subject, just as He corrected traditional errors on the subject of adultery. He could not have declared more absolutely than He did that marriage is a permanent compact, which neither the parties concerned nor any human power can dissolve; save on the conditions appointed by God Himself. Whatever those conditions might have been in the days of the people's hardness of heart1 it is clear that our New Lawgiver has decreed that one only offence, fornication, shall dissolve the marriage bond: whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery.2,3 Under the old law, the penalty of adultery was death; our Lord's legislation tacitly abolishes that: moreover, He gives porneia the same meaning as moichatai, which generally signifies the same offence committed by a married person. A remarkable phase of the same question occurs in connection with the new relations between married persons of differing faith. Our Lord had intimated that the divorced might marry again. St. Paul, in his treatment of the question as to the desertion, deliberate and final, of an unbelieving partner, says that the forsaken one is free: let him depart: a brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases.4 What the extent of this freedom is Scripture does not say; but it has generally been held that desertion is, equally with adultery, valid ground of divorce under the New Law 1 Matthew 19:8; 2 Matthew 19:9; 3 Mark 10:11-12; 4 1 Corinthians 7:15

3. The principles thus laid down must be inviolate, whatever human legislation may do: rather, all human legislation must conform to them. According to those principles marriage is not merely a civil contract: the Scriptures make it the most sacred relation of life; and nothing can be imagined more contrary to their spirit than the notion that a personal agreement, ratified in a human court, satisfies the obligation of this ordinance

Again, throughout the history of revelation, husband and wife are ONE FLESH,1 and there is no precedent in Scripture for making them merely partners or for giving the wife independent rights. The kindred therefore by AFFINITY, or through the marriage union, are as really related, though not so closely, as those who are kindred by CONSANGUINITY

1 Genesis 2:24

HISTORICAL

Many ecclesiastical controversies have arisen in this field of ethics which it is not within our province to discuss. These have had to do with the sacramental character of marriage, the compulsory celibacy of those devoted to the service of the Church, the law and practice of divorce, the modern application of the ancient Levitical law touching prohibited degrees, and the particular question of marriage with the sister of a deceased wife. Some of these points will be considered when we reach the sacraments, and others of them must be, noticed here only so far as they involve the New-Testament ethics

1. As to the first point: there have been two extremes, as we have seen, on the subject of the religious relation of marriage. It is in the Scripture a mystery but not a sacrament. The notion of a

specific sacramental grace, doing for man in the sphere of nature what the mystical fellowship with Christ does in the supernatural sphere, is an error, but a venial one in comparison of that which makes marriage a merely external union or mutual compact. The former error—to which reference will hereafter be made— has no sanction in the Word of God, and involves a certain dishonor done to the idea of a sacrament. But the latter seriously affects the very foundations of human religious society

2. It might be expected that the ancient churches which held the sacramental character of marriage would be rigid as to the doctrine of divorce. The Romanist doctrine of matrimony in fact allows of no separation of the parties, such as should allow them to marry again; but it multiplies causes of separation A MENSA ET THORO, and for pronouncing any marriage NULL AB INITIO. Legislation in Protestant states has varied much; but the general tendency has been to reduce the estate of Matrimony to a human arrangement under the control of human law, which by mutual consent the parties may for almost any reason dissolve. On the Continent of Europe there is scarcely any trace left, even among the Evangelical communities, of the ancient high tradition; and the present English law is imitating the Continent in this laxity: much to the scandal of our Christianity

3. POLYGAMY, in theory and practice, has had its advocates in every age; and in every age Divine revelation has protested against it with more or less of vigor. The Concubinage of the Old Testament may be cited in opposition to this statement. But when the instances in question are examined in the light of the New Testament, they will be found to confirm our principle. The polygamy of the patriarchs was in some cases an exceptional arrangement taken up into the scheme of Divine Providence. That of Solomon and the later kings was condemned and chastised. We have to do, however, with the New Testament, which leaves no room for doubt as to the full ratification of the original law Where Christianity is established Monogamy must vindicate itself as the order of God; but when Christianity is in conflict with heathen practice, the same discretion should be used in the suppression of old habits as is taught in the case of slavery. As to the Mormon revival of Polygamy it may be said that it is self-condemned

4. St. Paul speaks more than once of the Forbidden Degrees. When he is condemning the particular form of Corinthian incest, that one should have his father’s wife,1 he calls it Fornication, the generic term for offence against the purity of the marriage relation. He appeals to the Levitical code as still in force, but only as being grounded in the constitution of human nature. None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him.2 A man shall not take his father’s wife.3 This prohibition stands at the head of a number of interdicts, which are carried into their particulars: the force of the prohibition resting upon the natural abomination of union with the remainder of his flesh. The interdict does not absolutely extend to all the instances which this last expression would lead us to expect: they are taken for granted, as, for instance, the child of a brother. It is observable that there may be no union with the wife of a father’s brother: thou shall not approach his wife: she is thine aunt. From this it appears that this relationship, not one of blood, was sufficient reason for the prohibition. Hence it may be presumed that the sister of a wife would be under the same interdict. How far the probibited degrees of kindred extend is, however, matter of national legislation 1 Leviticus 18:14; 2 Deuteronomy 22:30; 3 Leviticus 18:6 PARENTS AND CHILDREN

Ethical principles regulating this relation exhibit a considerable development when we pursue them through the whole of Scripture. Christianity has consummated that development by removing certain peculiarities of the Mosaic legislation, by confirming the original ordinances of nature, and by superadding a specific reference to the common bond between Parents and Children in the Christian household of Faith. What Christian legislation says on this subject may be briefly summed up under the heads of Parental and Filial obligation respectively

1. Parental obligations include necessarily the Maintenance of children, their Education in its fullest sense, their Preparation for life, and Nurture for the Lord. These are all involved in the rights of children to the care of their parents as representatives of Providence. Care in things temporal is not forgotten: If any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith.1 It is upon the moral discipline that the New Testament lays its chief stress, as will appear from one of St Paul's pregnant sayings: Ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath; but nurture them in the chastening and admonition of the Lord.2 Here we gather that, negatively, the discipline is to be discreet, just, impartial, considerate; positively, it must include the entire education and specific admonition of the Christian faith. Thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children:3 this precept runs through the old economy and on into the new. Again and again it was enjoined upon the parents of the ancient dispensation that they should instruct their children in all the facts of the national history and in all the variety of symbol and type by which Divine things were taught by God.

It shall come to pass when your children shall say unto you, What mean ye by this service? that ye shall say.4 Hence the parental responsibility does not admit of transfer. The teaching of preceptors, whether in secular or in religious matters, is at best the necessary supply of the parents' duty: it must not supersede it, especially in Divine things. Claims of business, recreation, traveling, even of public worship and other services, must not interfere with this most absolute and paramount obligation of life. With the parent is the teaching of example and ceaseless influence as with no other and delegated authority. Catechetical and Sunday schools were never intended in any sense to interfere with this 1 1 Timothy 5:8; 2 Ephesians 6:4; 3 Deuteronomy 6:6-7; 4 Exodus 12:26-27

2. The filial obligations corresponding to parental rights, are Obedience, Reverence, and the Piety of grateful requital. In the order of nature, as represented by St. Paul, Obedience takes the lead: the reverence is a later expression of the filial sentiment. Children, obey your parents in the Lord; for this is right.1 It is right in the essential fitness of things, and what is generally right is specifically right in the Lord. Neither in the Old Testament nor in the New is there any restriction to this precept: as pertaining simply to the parental authority it is absolute, in all things.2 Of this Jesus Himself set the supreme example. And He went down with them, and came unto Nazareth, and was subject to them.3 Both parents are included in this authority. Reverence grows out of and strengthens and at the same time hallows this obedience. It is the reflection on the parents, as representatives of God, of the honor due to Him. Honor thy father and mother4 is a commandment which belongs rather to the first table than to the second: the word tima, is the same which is used of the respect due to the Supreme Father and to the Son: he that honoreth not the Son honoreth not the Father.5 Our Lord Who was subject to His earthly mother and Joseph said; I honor My Father.6 It is used also of reverence for royal authority, Honor the king;7 as of the respect due to man as in the image of God: Honor all men. If it is not said that God honors all men, at least this

honor have all His saints: If any man serve Me, him will My Father honor.8 Profound respect for parents as such is a duty which has no restriction: not even when their character forbids its being reverence in the strict sense of the word

1 Ephesians 6:1; 2 Colossians 3:20; 3 Luke 2:51; 4 Ephesians 6:2; 5 John 5:23; 6 John 8:49; 7 1 Peter 2:17; 8 John 12:26

3. But this filial honor to parents as such must take the form of recompense for their care as opportunity offers. Incidentally St. Paul introduces a touching reference to this. Using in one instance the term Piety, as uniting the service of religion to God and to parents, he says: let them learn first to show piety at home, and to requite their parents.1 The emphasis on this Christian virtue is remarkable: for that is good and acceptable before God. It also has its highest example in the Supreme Pattern whose last earthly care was to provide for His ever-faithful mother: Woman, behold thy son I Behold thy mother!2 1 1 Timothy 5:4; 2 John 19:26-27

4. There are certain limitations to these rights and obligations which nature prescribes and some which Christianity adds. There is a legal majority: of that the Scripture says nothing. Though this majority releases the child from some restraints, the sanctity of the parental and filial relation remains inviolate to the limit of life. The requital of parents implies that the bond continues to the end. There is a limitation, however, which seems to be introduced by Christianity in repression of the law of nature: namely, in all instances of conflict between the express will of Heaven and parental wishes. The law of God is to be supreme in all such cases of collision: Wist ye not that I must be about My Father’s business?1

1 Luke 2:49 MASTERS AND SERVANTS The moral teaching of Christianity has a very marked bearing on the family bond of Masters and Servants, including every variety of relation that may subsist between the employer and the employed, which in Scripture are generally regarded as pertaining to household life

1. The mutual rights, duties, and responsibilities of these relations are not in their widest range matter of direct statute in the Christian Scriptures: partly because they belong to the relations between man and man, and those of commerce, and those of the household; partly, because servants in the New Testament were generally, and in the Old very often, slaves. But the principles laid down by St. Paul are of permanent application, and mark the specific points in which Christian legislation affects the subject of ordinary servitude On the employer’s side there is the obligation of justice, the arbiter being the Lord: Give unto your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven.1 It is obvious that the Apostle here carries the question of what is just to servants into a higher court than human, because when he wrote the servant had scarcely any legal rights. Justice is now regulated, so far as wages go, by human law. But in all other respects the principle of justice must be observed under the control of a feeling that before the Master in heaven all are servants alike. On the side of the servants the duties are more copiously laid down: Exhort servants to be obedient unto their own masters, and to please them well in all things; not answering again; not purloining, but showing all good fidelity.2 Here the duty of the employed is determined by a standard from which modern ideas are fast receding. Obedience, cheerful and solicitous to please; humility, and silent acceptance of a superior will; all negative and all positive fidelity: these are the virtues of those who serve human masters according to the Divine will. Many other matters that complicate the relation are left to the

operation of a high principle that Christianity alone has introduced: the common relation of masters and servants is in the Lord.3 The exhortations to do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men;4 to adorn the doctrine of God our Savior in all things; and not with eyeservice as menpleasers,5 have their application to all servants of every degree to the end of time. And in them lie the special Christian ethics of this relation of universal family life 1 Colossians 4:1; 2 Titus 2:9-10; 3 Colossians 3:23; 4 Titus 2:10; 5 Ephesians 6:6

2. The question of Slavery arises here. The Epistles of the New Testament undoubtedly recognize it as an extant institution which must be undermined and abolished by the operation of Christian principle and not otherwise. It had been sanctioned by the Mosaic law; but in a form very different from that of Greece and Rome. Slaves, if Hebrews, recovered their liberty in the seventh year; in every case they were carefully protected and had their full religious privileges, being incorporated into the Jewish household. But, like polygamy and many other anomalies, slavery was tolerated only until the fullness of time. The coming of the New Legislator cleared away from the Divine statute book many statutes that were not good:1 not good absolutely, that is, though good for a preliminary dispensation. It introduced a universal amendment as well as spiritual codification of the old laws. And with regard to slavery He abolished it in principle by His very incarnation

If the Son therefore shall make you free!2 applies to this kind of bondage also. The Apostle Paul lays down the effectual emancipatory principles. First: There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.3 In the presence of the Lord there is and there can be no such thing as slavery; and this is the consolation of him whom men call a slave, But if thou mayest be made free, use it rather.4 No slave is required to be absolutely contented with his position: indeed, he is virtually enjoined to use all right means for his release. Thou owest unto me even thine own self.5 The whole of the Epistle to Philemon is a specimen of the way in which the Gospel sanctifies the abuse which it will in due time destroy. The first of these passages shows that Christianity knows no slavery; the second that the slave ought to be free; the third that Christian principles alone will accomplish his freedom 1 Ezekiel 20:25; 2 John 8:36; 3 Galatians 3:28; 4 1 Corinthians 7:21; 5 Philemon 1:19 THE HOUSEHOLD

Over and above the obligations and duties which have been referred to, there is yet another which imposes upon the Head of the household the responsibility of its holy government as a society separate and distinct in itself and having its ramifications elsewhere. One in every family is the representative of the Supreme, and is in the Christian household the teacher, the priest, and the ruler under Christ directly responsible to Him

1. The Household or Family occupies a prominent place throughout Scripture. It was the first form of society; and has continued to be the germ and representative of every other fellowship. In no dispensation has the family been merged in the congregation and forgotten or lost. Abraham before the Law had the church of God in his house. In his legislation Moses laid the heavy responsibility of household religion on every parent

David, rather in his Psalms than by his example, exhibits the same principle. Our Lord sanctified family religion by being the most blessed illustration of it for all His earlier years; and by governing His Apostolic company as a Master of the House,1 speaking of His disciples as them of His household. The Epistles generally penetrate through Churches to the families, addressing men as the heads of households, which includes more than their children. St. Paul writes, Let the deacons

be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well.

2 Here the house includes servants and all dependants; and the passage is further remarkable as indicating a certain analogy between the house of God which is the family and the house of God which is the Church 1 Matthew 10:25; 2 1 Timothy 3:12

2. There is only one head of the house; who is responsible for its instruction, worship, and godly discipline. That head may be of either sex, married or unmarried; consequently the household as such is independent of the married relation, and even of children. But the head is the husband, or bond of the house, in the normal state of things: though husband and wife are one, there cannot be a united head. As bound to maintain its Christian discipline, its Head is the priest of the family; and, unless incompetent to perform his duty or neglecting it, presents its worship daily to God. FAMILY WORSHIP is an institution specially prescribed and honored in the Old Testament: tacitly or indirectly in the New The church in thy house1 does not refer to the household of Philemon as such, but to that portion of the Christian community wont to meet there; yet it does indirectly suggest a family worship. Christians in regard to this obligation as well as that of brotherly love are Theodidaktoi: ye need not that I write unto you; for ye yourselves are taught of God.2 There ought to be no collision between the worship of the family and that of the congregation No household as such can ever be a church, save under anomalous and transitional circumstances such as those already referred to; and, on the other hand no public worship in the assembly dispenses from the family obligation to worship God. St John, in one of his two smaller Epistles, gives the final testimony of the New Testament as to the strictness of family discipline. Respecting the duty of keeping false doctrine and corrupt teachers out of the household, he writes: If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed:3 whether he come in person or by his writings, or in any way whatever. And this is made more emphatic by the fact, that the guardian of the household faith was in this case a woman This final testimony does not receive all the attention that it demands. Issued in the name of the Savior, arid by the representative of a religion of charity, the injunction to have no domestic fellowship with an enemy of the Incarnation is of great weight 1 Philemon 1:2; 2 1 Thessalonians 4:9; 3 2 John 1:10 ETHICS OF SOCIAL ANDCOMMERCIAL RELATIONS

Christianity sanctions the principles on which commerce is based; enforces the rigorous principles of personal morality in the conduct of it; and lays around it some specific safeguards of the utmost importance. We have only to do with the specific Christian teaching

I. Commerce stands here for all that industry and activity which develops the resources of the earth, creates property, and advances culture. The Religion of Jesus sanctions all its fundamental principles, though for the most part only in an indirect way. It teaches that Property is of God, whose will has ordained that His creatures should have exclusive possession of certain things which they may call their own. Our Lord came not to destroy the ordinances of nature and the original charter on which mankind inherited the earth

He has confirmed that primary constitution of things according to which man was ordained to replenish the earth and subdue it,1 and extract from it its resources. The same natural law that declares it wrong to take from another his possession requires the deeper principle that he has a possession which may be taken: the prohibition, thou shalt not steal,2 implies the personal right to something of one’s own. The question how such property is acquired now, or was acquired

originally, and by what tenure it is held in its various forms, does not here enter into consideration. It is enough that the Divine order for the development of man individually and collectively requires the idea of personal possessions, and their use and multiplication in commerce. It is lawful to possess and accumulate the substance which commerce makes its Capital and from which it derives Interest. This is a fundamental principle which the Bible nowhere contradicts; in it all the laws of honest merchandise have the fullest sanction. In fact, every other theory is opposed by the tenor of Scripture. In its pages might is nowhere the foundation of rights; the possession of property is never made dependent upon the caprices of popular will, or social compact. There is no sanction of COMMUNISM. The COMMUNITY OF GOODS in the Acts was extraordinary, and the result of a special influence of the Spirit; voluntary, and binding on none; transitory, and soon gave way again to the common order of life; and prophetic of a far distant future 1 Genesis 1:28; 2 Exodus 20:15

II. The ethics of commerce, as they are affected by Christian teaching, are of more importance. They are both direct and indirect; partly general principles, and partly safeguards

1. It is a primary law of the New-Testament legislation that the principles which regulate personal holiness must be carried into the commerce of life. For instance, Thou shalt not steal;1 the precept which forbids all injury to the property of another, must carry its sanction into trade: condemning fraud of every kind, whether by false representation, by adulteration, by overreaching, or by any other of those numberless methods of advancing one's own interest at the expense of others which are the disgrace of modern trading. But the positive virtues which belong to ordinary life must be carried into commerce. Not slothful in business2 is a general precept which may bear this special application: it is true that tee spoudee mee okneeroi has no such reference to business in the modern sense of the word as many suppose; but that which is a virtue in the whole course of life is a virtue in commerce, and the secret of success. The hand of the diligent maketh rich:3 the blessing of God rests upon the operation of a natural law. Let him that stole, steal no more is followed by: but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth.4 We commanded you, that if any would not work neither should he eat.5 1 Exodus 20:15; 2 Romans 12:11; 3 Proverbs 10:4; 4 Ephesians 4:28; 5 2 Thessalonians 3:10

2. While the Christian legislation sanctions all kinds of industry and all enterprises of civilization, it throws around the whole many safeguards which may be said to constitute a large part of its commercial ethics. For instance, the precept, Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus1 forbids the engaging in any occupation which cannot be sanctified in all its details by that Name. This injunction would cut off very much of the speculative enterprise of commerce, though by no means all of it. The indirect precept contained in the injunction, Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth,2 with others like it, such as this, It remaineth . . . those that use the world as not abusing it,3 affects these ethics profoundly, inasmuch as they forbid all accumulating for the sake of hoarding riches. It is possible though difficult, and it is necessary, to make a distinction between the commercial possession of substance, or the possession of it as a steward, and the personal complacency and delight in it. Substance may be and must be increased in order to prosperous commerce, and many of the Divine promises expressly sanction and sanctify this. But there is no teaching either in the Gospels or in the Epistles which permits the accumulation of earthly treasure for self. Lay not up for yourselves

treasures upon earth4 is a precept for every spiritual man in Christ, who must in the ground of his nature be poor in spirit. The design to acquire the means of usefulness sanctifies thrift; but there is no department of probation which requires more watchfulness and discretion 1 Colossians 3:17; 2 Colossians 3:2; 3 1 Corinthians 7:29-31; 4 Matthew 6:19 POLITICAL ETHICS

Revelation has from the beginning been bound up with the social and political affairs of the world; and has shown the contact of religion with every kind of developing rule among men: from the primitive household and family, its simplest and typical form, to imperial despotism. We have now to do with the general principles of New-Testament teaching, both as to the rulers and as to the ruled

I. The institution of government is Divine: not founded on any compact or agreement among men, as the modern figment is. The more carefully we examine the basis of tribal and national distinctions among men—in other words what goes to constitute a distinct people—the more clearly shall we perceive that it is conditioned by a certain relation to God Whose worship was the original bond of unity to every race, and Whose representative the earthly ruler was. Government was made for man and man was also made for it. The form of that government is not prescribed rigidly and definitively: certainly not in the Christian legislation. Every form of valid authority is sanctified in the Old Testament. The New Testament introduces a universal Monarchy in the spiritual economy of things; and only in a very subordinate way deals with the kingdoms of this world.1 But the foundations of civil and political society for earth were laid in heaven: the powers that be are ordained of God.2 Human magistrates represent the Supreme Judge: being in the state His deputies. He is the minister of God to thee for good: for the protection and peace of the law-abiding. He is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath:3 for the administration of the Divine justice on transgressors. These principles are indisputable. The same term is used concerning the representation of ecclesiastical authority in the church and in the world: they are both diakonoi and leitourgoi, or ministers.4 1 Revelation 11:15; 2 Romans 8:1; 3 Romans 13:4; 4 Romans 13:6

II. Obedience to magistrates and the government of the land is made part of the Christian law: expressly included in His ethics by our Lord on the broad ground of the duty to render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's,1 though the Caesar of that day held the land in bondage. St. Paul recognized in his own person, and commands all men to recognize, what was at best a despotic and cruel authority

1 Matthew 22:21

1. The duty of submission is, first, in a certain sense, passive. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves judgment.1 This forbids, negatively, personal insurrection and resistance. How far submission is to be carried, at what point resistance is permitted—not to the individual as such, but to a people—is a question which our present ethics do not contemplate. Inter arma leges silent. The obligation comes in, however, before the arms are taken up. No individual Christian may resist without betraying his trust, and losing the meekness of his wisdom. When the question is concerning the law of his God,2 the servant of Jehovah must resist, but not until submission has had its perfect work 1 Romans 13:2; 2 Daniel 6:5

2. Positively, obedience to the government requires that diligence be given to uphold the honor of the law at all points, and that for conscience sake. Much emphasis is laid both by our Lord and by His Apostles on paying tribute to whom tribute is due: a principle which involves very important issues. For this cause pay ye tribute also.1 Let it be observed that St. Paul's ethics of submission to government follow and are, as it were, incorporated with his sublimest and most comprehensive doctrine of Christian morality

1 Romans 13:5-7

3. The Bible, from beginning to end, inculcates and honors PATRIOTISM. It has been sometimes said that neither the sentiment of love to country nor that of personal friendship finds a place in Christian ethics. It is true that the supreme devotion to a kingdom which is not of this world1 everywhere has the preeminence; and that the individual sympathies of friendship are merged in brotherly love. But both these sentiments are really inculcated and encouraged. There is no profane history that surpasses or equals its annals in examples of both, and Christianity must have the benefit of the old religion of which it is in a certain sense a continuation

1 John 18:36 ETHICS OF THE CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP A wide department of what may be called Ecclesiastical Ethics has been created by Christianity The Christian Society inherited the Ethics of Judaism. But the bond of fellowship has changed, as also its relation to the world; and with these changes corresponding duties and responsibilities have arisen. Our ethical system will not be complete without some remarks on the general principles of Christian duty as connected with Christian communion, under the three heads of the external organization, the internal fellowship, and the common mission, of the Christian Society as laws are prescribed for it in the New Testament. The next section, that of the Church, will open up this subject more fully

Here it will be viewed only in its general principles as regulating one specific branch of Christian Morals. It must be remembered that the question concerns only those who belong to the community of Christ; the preliminary duty of the Church to offer its privileges to all, and of every man to accept these privileges, is not here discussed. It has been considered already and will arise again

I. Membership in the external Church confers rights and imposes obligations. Here we have to regard the religious Society founded by our Lord as being the depository and representative of His will, and the trustee of His commandments

1. It is His law, that every believer should be added1 to the church by the rite of baptism: this is not left optional, either to the adult believer himself, or, as we shall see, to the parent of Christian children who must be baptized. The Eucharist also imposes a duty whilst it confers a privilege: This do in remembrance of Me. This do ye, as oft as ye drink it.2 1 Acts 2:47; 2 1 Corinthians 11:25

2. Submission to the authority of those whom He sets as pastors and rulers over His people is a Christian duty, to which corresponds the obligation of the same pastors and rulers to watch for the people's souls and instruct them in the truths of religion: obey them that have the rule over you.1 The sanctions of the commandments binding upon the Society in its external constitution are manifold: the extreme is what became afterwards known as separation from the Church, or excommunication

1 Hebrews 13:17

3. The ethics of ecclesiastical worship are distinct from those of devotion generally. They involve some matters of great importance, which, however, will be more fully considered when the Church is the subject. Public worship, the sanctification of the Lord's Day, and attendance on services prescribed by due authority, belong to this class of positive laws Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is.1 Modern Christianity brings into prominence some ethical questions as to the obligation of submitting to ordinances of Christian fellowship and worship which the several communities appoint, without express authority of the Word of God. In other words, every community has the nature of a Society as well as of a Church; and every one who binds himself to the usages of the Society is bound by them. On the other hand, the Society must so regulate its legislation as to pay deference to the Scriptural and superior enactments for the universal Church as such. Those Societies within Catholic Christendom have prospered most which have wisely adapted their bye-laws, and skilfully subordinated them to the laws of the Church as laid down by the Savior and His Apostles. But the further consideration of this whole question belongs to the next section, that of the Church

1 Hebrews 10:25

II. The internal fellowship of the Christian Society involves a large body of ethics that may here be alluded to in a preliminary way. They fall under two branches: such as refer to the obligations of brotherly love and mutual kindness among the members themselves, and such as govern the relations of the fellowship to the outer world or them that are without.1 1 1 Corinthians 5:13 1. The specific form of charity which is BROTHERLY KINDNESS:1 shown in mutual watchfulness, practical admonishing one another2 bearing one another's burdens,3 mutual edification and sympathy and help. The foundation of all these ethics is given in our Lord's words: All ye are brethren.4 They prescribe the most self-denying and careful and persevering attention to the claims of the sick and sorrowful and needy of the flock; and the support, according to every man's ability, of all the institutions of charity that the Society contains 1 2 Peter 1:7; 2 Colossians 3:16; 3 Galatians 6:2; 4 Matthew 28:8

2. One of the most important branches of the ethical obligations we now consider is that which regulates the bearing of the Christian Society on the world without. Here there are two distinct and seemingly opposite aspects of the subject

(1.) There is a sense in which the Christian Fellowship is bound to maintain its absolute separation from the world. It is a community which is passing through the present scene of things as a band of pilgrims. Much of our Lord's directory of duty, as well of His Apostles', regards the present constitution of things as passing away, tolerated only by the Christian discipleship, and permitting usages which are to be conformed to only under protest or by way of accommodation to national laws. Of this character is the legislation concerning Oaths and some other matters which will be considered elsewhere. It may be said that a keen solicitude to maintain the honor of the religious community as the kingdom of heaven is inculcated. But it shall not be so among you!1 This principle involves many difficulties especially in regard to social relations: and this therefore is a very difficult branch of conventional ethics. There is a separation from the world which is rigorously demanded of the Christian fellowship as such: Come out from among them and be ye separate!2 By five distinct terms St. Paul marks the contrariety between the world and the Church. What

fellowship, [metochee,] hath righteousness with unrighteousness? what communion, [koinoonia,] hath light with darkness? And what concord, sumfooneesis, hath Christ with Belial? or what part, [meris] hath he that believeth with an infidel? and what agreement, [thesis,], hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God, as God hath said, I will dwell in them. The Epistles constantly make the dignity of the Christian fellowship an argument for high propriety: Do all things without murmurings and disputings; that ye maybe blameless and harmless, children of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom ye shine as lights in the world, holding forth the word of life.3 1 Matthew 20:26; 2 2 Corinthians 6:14-18; 3 Php 2:14-16

(2.) But this passage carries our thought to another aspect of these ethics. The Christian Society must penetrate the world around with a holy influence. Ye are the light of the world! Ye are the salt of the earth!1 The duty of our Lord's disciples is to carry with them an influence which shall pervade social life; and while, with regard to it—its festivities, recreations, diversions—the Christian law strictly demands that all should be so ordered as not to dishonor that Worthy Name by the which ye are called,2 it demands also that in the midst of the world, or of that kind of semi-religious life which often comes near to what the New Testament calls the world, a pure and holy example should be set by those who are spiritual 1 Matthew 5:13-14; 2 James 2:7

(3.) There is great difficulty in reconciling these two aspects of our ethics. But they must be harmonized. The passage quoted above from the Philippian Epistle is chiefly of a negative character: it shows what the sons of God must be in contrast with others. There is another passage in the same Epistle which is more full and complete in its bearing on this subject.

Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are reverend, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things. Those things which ye have both learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me, do: and the God of peace shall be with you.1 This perfect compendium of Christian morals regards the Brethren as setting their thought —their rightly estimating, studious and pondering, affectionate and ardent, practical and energetic, peaceful and triumphant— thought on all the obligations of morality in its highest perfection. But some of the elements of the description show that it is an excellence which must be known and seen and read of all men. The Church is before the world's bar

1 Php 4:8-9

III. The ethics of the Church's mission next claim attention. Hitherto we have considered the obligations arising from the common fellowship as within; but there is a duty incumbent on every Christian to co-operate with his fellows for the spread of the kingdom of Christ around and to the ends of the earth

1. Here is the corporate obligation of universal Christendom to preserve the Faith, to diffuse it, to wield its truth in the contest with all error, to demand from men submission to the Gospel, and to put forth every effort to evangelize the world. The Catholic Body as such has this for its first and great command, which briefly comprehends every other

2. This corporate obligation rests upon the several Evangelical branches of Christendom: it may be an unreality to speak of its resting upon the universal Church as such; since it has been long

the demonstrated will of the Spirit that the various sections of the Christian Commonwealth should carry on the work of discipling all nations. Hence it is the duty of every religious community, either alone or in combination with other similar bodies, to engage in the common effort to spread the Gospel: an obligation never enough remembered until the present century

3. The most solemn and binding of all personal responsibilities are those which require every individual member of the body to make its universal work his own. This is the peculiarity and also the perfection of Christian ethics, that every duty which it enjoins and every grace which it commends has some reference, more or less direct, to the Church of God which is the kingdom of Christ. The relation of the individual to the fellowship of the saints pervades the New Testament. There can be, strictly speaking, no isolated religion: every Christian man belongs to the visible household of faith, and is partaker of all its privileges and responsibilities. In virtue of the universal priesthood of believers—of which more hereafter—all who name the name of Jesus are regarded as under an obligation to preach His Gospel, and promote His glory in the Church, and make the salvation of souls their business for His sake. The Christian is born into a new world; and his relations to the new economy do not permit him to regard himself for a moment as an independent unit. After St. Paul had spoken of the ministries of the appointed and ordained agents of tie Spirit, he goes on to speak of the growing up of the entire community into the Head, even Christ; from Whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love.1 This great word, read in the light of the hymn to charity, is the final expression of ecclesiastical ethics. None of us liveth to himself.2 Every joint supplieth strength; every part effectually worketh;3 and the growth of the whole body in love is the contribution of all the members in particular. The Christian ceases from self not only in Christ but in His body the Church: it is no longer to him an independent principle and end of action; no longer an end at all as distinct from a higher end. This is the doctrine of that Philippian chapter which shows how Self is lost in Jesus, and then found again in the care of our own and of others' souls. Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus: here is the supreme example of self-renunciation. They all seek their own things, not the things which are Jesus Christ's: here is the perfect opposite. Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling:4 this shows that solicitude for self is not to be utterly abolished

Look not every man on his own things, but also on the things of others: here is the unity of care for self and care for our neighbor in the common self-surrender to the Lord and His service 1 Ephesians 4:15-16; 2 1 Corinthians 13:1-13; 3 Romans 14:7; 4 Php 2:5; Php 2:21; Php 2:13; Php 2:4

35. Vol 03 - The Christian Church

The Christian Church THE CHURCH ITS HISTORICAL FOUNDATION Gospel Preparations;

Pentecostal Establishment ATTRIBUTES AND NOTES Unity One and Manifold;

Holy and Mixed;

Visible and Invisible;

Catholic and Local;

Indefectible and Mutable;

Militant and Triumphant;

Bearing of the Notes on Ecclesiastical History INSTITUTE FOR WORSHIP DIVINE SERVICE OR WORSHIP THE MEANS OF GRACE THE WORD AND PRAYER THE SACRAMENTS Ecclesiastical Theories as to the Sign and Seal;

Multiplication of Sacraments;

Under-valuation

BAPTISM

Scripture;

Historical and Controversial. .

EUCHARIST

Scripture;

Historical and Controversial. THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY THE UNIVERSAL PRIESTHOOD OFFICES EXTRAORDINARY AND TRANSITIONAL THE ORDINARY AND PERMANENT MINISTRY THE PASTORAL OFFICE THE DIACONATE VOCATION AND ORDINATION

HISTORICAL Theories of the Ministry THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD The witness of truth The missionary institute THE CHURCH AND THE KINGDOM The Christian Church is the sphere as well as the organ of the Spirit’s administration of redemption. As a corporate body it was founded by our Lord Jesus Christ; is invested with certain attributes and notes as the representative of His agency among men; discharges its functions as an institute of worship and depository of the Faith; has definite obligations to the world as an instrument for its conversion; and, lastly, bears special relations in its temporal form to the eternal Kingdom of Christ

These several branches of the one subject must be considered in relation to Biblical, Dogmatic, and Historical Theology: from the Word of God we gather the materials for the true doctrinal statement; and make this the standard by which to test the various ecclesiastical phenomena of

the Christian world. That this whole question belongs generally to the Administration of Redemption has been already shown at the outset, where the special relations of the Holy Spirit to the work of the Redeemer was the subject. It may be added that many topics connected with this department of theology must needs be distributed over several sections, especially those of the Three Offices of Christ and the consummation of the Kingdom in Eschatology THE HISTORICAL FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH A large portion of the New Testament is occupied with the details of the establishment of the Church as Christ's new institution: more particularly, this is a prominent subject down to the beginning of the Acts. We may embrace the whole under two heads: the preparations made by our Lord in the Gospels, and its actual foundation on the Day of Pentecost THE PREPARATIONS IN THE GOSPELS

1. Our Lord proclaimed the advent in His own person of the kingdom of heaven,1 or the kingdom of God.2 His new revelation to mankind was the Gospel of the Kingdom:3 the Baptist preached its coming, as the forerunner both of Christ and of the Apostles; and the Savior made it the subject of His teaching until the day in which He was taken up.4 By this term He linked His own government with the ancient Theocracy: but not with its earthly form; for His was the kingdom of heaven,5 as such predicted, though not by that name, throughout the prophets. The new kingdom, however, was a mystery revealed: and the main secret of that mystery lay in the fact that, while it was still the kingdom of God, it was also the Messiah's, the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ,6 the kingdom of Jesus the Son Incarnate. The phrase pervades the Lord's teaching; down to the last He was speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.7 It was not however His purpose that it should be retained as the denomination of His new community. The company of His people is the sphere of His reign to the end of time; but the name and character of the dominion is held in abeyance until the consummation of all, until its final manifestation as the one kingdom of heaven and earth, of God and man, of Christ and His saints: it was of that the Incarnate Redeemer spoke, when, at the close of His ministry, throwing off all reserve, He termed it My kingdom.8 As our study here begins with this name, so it will revolve back to it at the close; and meanwhile the first prayer of Christendom is, Thy kingdom come:9 a prayer that will end only when all prayer shall cease

1 Matthew 4:17; 2 Mark 1:15; 3 Matthew 24:14; 4 Acts 1:2-3; 5 Revelation 11:15; 6 Revelation 1:9; 7 Acts 1:3; 8 Luke 22:30; 9 Matthew 6:10

2. At a memorable crisis in His history our Lord gave His institution its new name: MY CHURCH.1 Twice, and twice only, He used it; and on two occasions closely connected: both instances, be it observed, occurring in the very midst of St. Matthew's special collection of parables and discourses concerning the kingdom. In the former, it seems to be the great temple or house of prayer for all nations,2 in all ages, and for the worship of eternity; in the latter, the visible assembly of Christian people, gathered together in one place for the administration of His laws. Putting the two passages together, we have a summary of the Saviour's will concerning His future congregation. He gave it then a name that we need not yet further expound: the word ekkloosia has from that day had the pre-eminence over every other by which the fellowship of Christians may be described No one who considers this origin of the term will consent to allow it to be displaced by any other. The abuses of it should not bring it into contempt 1 Matthew 16:18; Matthew 18:17; 2 Mark 11:17

3. It is observable that our Lord, having given this new name, and thrown a brief but effectual ray of light upon first the invisible and then the visible congregation of the future, did not again mention the word: leaving it for future use. His parables and discourses flowed on in their former channel, keeping the kingdom of God in view. But the last discourses including the last prayer give some elements of teaching concerning the future Church which are of the deepest interest. These will only be alluded to now: the fuller exposition of their meaning must be reserved for the future. Provision was made for the permanent memorial of redemption in the Holy Supper: the sacrament of His people's corporate unity with Himself and with each other as the heirs of a new covenant. Baptism, the sacramental rite of initiation, was also substituted for the ancient rite of circumcision, now virtually abolished. The new congregation or church was, as it were, formally consecrated to God by its Head in what may be called the High-priestly Prayer:1 the first Prayer in His own house.2 In it He refers to the company of believers as given Him of the Father: the suffering obedience which nevertheless purchased the gift is kept back or dimly alluded to; as kept from the would, or, as one afterwards said who heard the words, preserved in Jesus Christ;3 and to be made perfect in one, in that spiritual and eternal unity of perfection of which the highest type is to be sought though it can never be found in the interior relations of the Trinity. But it is observable that the Savior speaks of this new community, describes it, and prays for it, as future. Even after His passion, when the resurrection had put all power in His hands, and He appeared in the midst of His disciples as their glorified Head, the New Fellowship was yet in the future

He spent forty days in speaking about its history or destiny,4 and His Apostles' duty in the coming days; doubtless gave many instructions that have not been recorded; but always His Church was yet to come 1 John 17:1-26; 2 Hebrews 3:6; 3 Jude 1:1; 4Acts 3:4

4. While it is true that the Church, in the strict sense of the word, and as a corporate institute, was not founded while the Lord was upon earth, in another sense He was laying its foundation during the whole of His ministry. He left a large body of instruction concerning it which waited only for the Day of Pentecost to disclose its fullness of meaning. The germs and principles of all that is to follow in this branch of theology are to be found in the Gospels: indeed, we may be more bold, and say that nothing on this subject, or any subject, can go beyond the meaning of the Lord's own words. He spoke of the Comforter as the future Divine Presence in the congregation; but His office was only to glorify, expound, and expand the sayings of the Redeemer Himself. We shall find that this holds true in a very remarkable degree concerning the doctrine of the new Church or Kingdom. A large part of the Saviour's teaching in the four Gospels treats of its nature, of the methods of its spread, of the character of its subjects, of its relations to the world, and of the principles of His own government in it. The development of this teaching will appear in all that the subject brings before us THE PENTECOSTAL FOUNDATION The Day of Pentecost was the epoch of the foundation of the Christian Church. The prepared disciples of Christ were assembled, and upon them the Holy Ghost came down, making them the New Temple of the Triune God. Those were added whose faith received the preaching of the Finished Gospel; and the disciples were constituted into an organized and visible fellowship, to continue for ever during this dispensation under the government of the Spirit as the representative of Jesus its Head

1. The institute of the Feast of Weeks, representing the presentation of the Jewish harvest firstfruits, typified the oblation of the first-fruits of the Christian ingathering. It also, though not by Divine enactment, commemorated the giving of the Law, and had its antitype in the full revelation

of the New Law of Faith. The Risen Lord appointed a meeting of His disciples in Galilee for the proclamation of His Kingdom; but bade them wait in Jerusalem for the founding of His Church. There they received, as representatives of the Saviour's old discipleship and the germ of the future body, that baptism of the Spirit which was to them, as their special dignity, instead of the baptism of water. But the Holy Ghost represented the Triune God, now fully revealed, Who took possession of this consecrated body, and made them the new Temple or Church. The Shekinah, which was the symbol of the union of God with man, appeared for the last time, and was resolved into the Personal Spirit, the Presence of God in the midst of His people, and resting upon every person present from the Apostles downward. And it sat upon each of them.1

1 Acts 2:11

2. After the wonderful works of God had been proclaimed by the many new tongues of the worshipping assembly, the one new tongue of the preaching brotherhood began the everlasting Gospel. The new Law was the proclamation of the finished work of Christ The day of the foundation thus gives the first and perhaps the most complete exhibition of the process by which the Church is to be formed to the end of time. The ekkloosia is the company called out from the mass by the preaching of the completed redemption of the Incarnate Mediator. It is the CHURCH as gathered from the world; it is the CONGREGATION as assembled together; it is the FELLOWSHIP as replenished with common gifts. And these three ought to be one

3. This Day also began the organization of the community: that is, if we include the final words of the chapter as belonging to its history. The elements of order, prepared in the Gospels, now take their instant and permanent form. Pentecost is the typical day of the future of Christendom: in the morning the worshipping assembly, glorifying God for the accomplishment of all His purposes; in its noon the full Evangelical preaching; the rest of it given to organization and fellowship. Amidst such shaking of heaven and earth as was never known before, whilst the Christian company was in its first ecstasy of worship, and the crowd in the strong excitement of conviction, the water of Baptism begins to flow as the symbol of order and of introduction to the new fellowship. And, as the rite of initiation was remembered in honor of the Lord's final command, so the community was immediately organized within. Here first indeed we have the ekkloosia, or church, mentioned as an historical fact: the Lord added to the church daily such as were in course of salvation.1 And what was the course or process of salvation? The Apostles' doctrine:2 that is, the Great Confession of an earlier day expanded by the Apostles; their fellowship, that is, the submission to all the obligations of the society life that day begun, and the enjoyment of the blessings of the Christian covenant under Apostolical sanction; the breaking of bread, the Lord's Supper this, not the Apostles'; and, as embracing, and pervading, and sanctifying all, the prayers ordered by the new Spirit of adoption 1 Acts 2:47; 2 Matthew 16:18

4. The later New Testament—the Acts and the Epistles being interwoven into one history of the beginnings of the perfected fellowship—shows us the gradual consolidation of the economy of the Church, under the guidance of the Apostles, who were for a season all in all as Christ had been. As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you.1 We see the formation of a pastoral ministry in its elements afterwards to be developed. We see the growth of the community from without by the preaching of the Word, from within by the incorporation of the children of believers. Meanwhile, orderly arrangement never fails The new brotherhood was not molded by an esoteric influence,

acting like a philosophy: the leaven leavened a lump which the Holy Spirit shaped into a body as fully and exactly organized as any known to men. Simple as are the elements of this primitive ecclesiastical polity, it is very sharply defined. The visible Jesus, surrounded by His disciples, was not more isolated and apart from the mass of the people around, than His Church is, under the influence of His Spirit, marked off and isolated from the world. And that organization, thus perfectly sketched, remains as the standard of order in the congregation for ever

1 John 20:21

5. This Day placed the Christian community under the jurisdiction and government of the Holy Ghost. What the presence of Christ was in the Gospels, the Head without a corporate body, the presence of the Spirit is, representing the Invisible Head of a body now visible. This doctrine is vital in many ways. It overturns the delusion of any earthly vicar of Christ There is one body and one Spirit.1 What the great hierarchical theory gives to the Pontiff is taken only by usurpation. The delegated headship of the Holy Ghost is the security of the infallibility and in-defectibility of the Christian Body in the conservation of the truth. The Spirit of life2 is strong against every enemy of the Church: the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it.3 For He is the Giver of life: of all ecclesiastical life, as well organic as individual. He moulds its elements and fashions them as He will: being to kurion to soopoion, as defined in the Nicene Creed. There are crises in the history of Christianity when new forms are given to the outward organization, and He makes those a people who were not a people.4 This truth may be and has been perverted; but the Spirit Himself vindicates it in His own way, and the history of Christendom cannot be understood without it. More generally He is the Source of all energy and strength to the body of Christ upon earth: He is the breath of lives,5 of many lives, inbreathed into it, and Himself the Inbreather. Lastly, the Spirit is the Representative of the Lord, Whose Headship abideth ever. He acts for Christ in His one Person. As the whole Trinity generally is represented by the Spirit, and not the Father alone, so it is the whole Christ and not the Eternal Son alone. But, as the Lord's Vicegerent in His Church, Be does not exclude the Lord Himself. When the Savior declared the necessity of His going in order that the Spirit might come, He so spake as to reserve His own dignity as that of One who would be never absent. I will come to you. He shall take of Mine.6 It is not as in the case of that other Forerunner: He must increase, but I must decrease.7 The Lord Christ Himself, and not the Spirit, is Head over all things to the church.8 We know that the presence of our Intercessor is behind the veil, we know also that in the Holy Ghost He is here also: at hand as well as afar off.9 One name is common to the heavenly and the earthly Head: that of Parakleeton or Advocate. He who pleads FOR the people, our Advocate with the Father10 in words unheard, pleads IN them by the Spirit Who maketh intercession for us with groanings not spoken.11 It is time that the phraseology of the Acts introduces a great change in the Divine personality: the I is that of a Third Voice not heard before. As, passing from the Old Testament into the Gospels, we have a new Divine Speaker, so it is in the Acts. Separate Me!12 is the command of the Holy Ghost. But, as the Father sometimes is heard during the earthly dispensation of the Son, and is never absent, so the Lord Jesus in the Acts is never absent, and sometimes speaks in His own name. He is King in His kingdom: He has that universal kingship which He will surrender at the last day; He has that special kingship over His redeemed which will not really begin or be consummated till the last day. But He is in Apostolical language the Head over His Church, the Head of the Church, rather than its King. This indicates, if possible, a yet nearer and closer relation. The Incarnate Person has a union with. His

Body unshared and preeminently His own. It is the Church of God13—or the Lord—which He hath purchased with His own blood.14 We return to His own first word: MY CHURCH!

1 Ephesians 4:4; 2 Romans 8:2; 3 Matthew 16:18; 4 1 Peter 2:10; 5 Genesis 2:7; 6 John 14:18; John 16:15; 7 John 3:30; 8 Ephesians 1:22; 9 Jeremiah 23:23; 10 1 John 2:1; 11 Romans 8:26; 12 Acts 13:2; 13 Acts 20:28; 14 Matthew 16:18 ATTRIBUTES AND NOTES OF THE CHURCH The Church in the later New Testament is represented passively as the Temple of God, actively as the Body or organ of Christ's manifestation: the former, as the sphere of Divine worship and holy influence; the latter, as the instrument of Christ's manifold operations on earth. To both, in their unity, there are certain attributes assigned in Scripture, the study of which brings before us the whole subject in the most complete way. These qualities are Unity, Sanctity, Invisibility, Catholicity, Apostolicity, Indefectibility, Glory. But we also find by the side of these, which generally describe the Body in its higher and ideal character, qualities in some measure their counterparts or opposites: such as Diversity, Imperfection, Visibility, Localisation, Confessionalism, Mutability, and Militant Weakness. Hence we gather that the true church of Christ is a body in which these opposite attributes unite

1. These correlative qualities of the one Church of Christ suggest a certain analogy with the Person of its Head in Whom Divine perfections and human attributes meet. It also is one organized body with two natures or modes of presentations. The concept church is not that of a Divine body and a human; but of one reality under two exhibitions, as in the case of our Incarnate Lord. But the analogy must not be pressed too far. Here there is the same reserve and the same protection that was found necessary in the higher doctrine. As the Son of God uses human nature as His body or flesh, He is the same with humanity As He occupies it as a temple He is distinct from it. The church is the temple of Christ: it is inhabited by Him. It is His body: the complement or fullness of Himself. The higher and Divine church is in the visible and human as a temple: distinct from it. It acts and works in the human as a body: inseparable from it. We have to speak of all its attributes—higher and lower, Divine and human, temporal and eternal—as belonging to the one church. And the habit of doing this saves from much confusion

2. These attributes are in Historical Theology transformed into Notes, by which, as tests, the true Church is supposed to be known. In the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, as united, those are specified as four: One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic. The controversial theology of Borne has multiplied these Notes very abundantly. We shall adopt the method of connecting each attribute with its seeming counterpart as the ideal community is realized in the world. There will, of course, be less to be said on each series of opposites as we proceed, because each more or less anticipates those that follow. Moreover, these Attributes and Notes do not exhaust the subject, being dwelt upon only as introductory to what follows ONE AND MANIFOLD

Unity and Variety are both and alike essential to the idea of the Christian Church; and their sound combination is a test that may be applied to all ecclesiastical systems

SCRIPTURE The Scriptural doctrine on this subject will be most fully exhibited by considering, first, the universal Body of Christ of which the Christian Church is the last earthly form; secondly, the Christian Fellowship proper as an institution. As to the first, the note of manifoldness is most conspicuous; as to the second, oneness and multiplicity unite

I. Taking the largest view of the Church of Christ as the fellowship of the people of God in every age, we may affirm that unity in manifoldness has been its law of existence and development. Its oneness from the beginning is recognized throughout the Scripture as founded upon the common redemption, whether revealed or unrevealed. The Holy Company of all ages has been one in the unity of many forms and varieties of manifestation. It is the company of the nations of them which are saved;1 the Church of the Redeemed out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation;2 the unseen unity of all those of whom it is said in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him;3 the children of God that are scattered abroad,4 and gathered together in Christ. Hence it binds together the several economies: the Patriarchal Church, the Jewish and the Christian: one as the kingdom of God,5 or the Civitas Dei running its course through all ages. In this large sense it unites all the forms of the Church to which we shall refer: the Church as universal, or as in a province, or as in a city, or as in a building, or as in a house 1 Revelation 21:24; 2 Revelation 5:9; 3 Acts 10:35; 4 John 11:52; 5 Mark 1:15

II. But the Christian Church as an institution founded by Jesus is one and manifold; its unity in the Spirit of its Head being the blending of many believers in one common confession, and their participation in one common grace. The teaching of the New Testament may be viewed, first, as to the essentials of oneness and then as to the breaches of that oneness. From these we may gather the true doctrine of Scripture

1. The unity of the Church has but one ground, that of a common union with Christ; nor is there any positive reference to it which does not make that prominent. The first word on the subject is that of the High Priest, whose Unction is the bond of His people’s union with Himself and with each other: that they all may be one: as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me.1 The former part refers to a unity never to be seen or understood of men; the latter to such a spiritual manifestation of that holy fellowship as may suggest to all who witness its effects the secret of its bond. It was reserved for St. Paul to expound these words of our Lord, in the Epistle which comes nearest to the idea of a treatise on the Church. He speaks of unity nine times in one paragraph, and in five applications. There is one God and Father of all;2 and there is one Lord, the common Revealer of that Father and Redeemer of men; and in Him there is one faith, one baptism, or confession of doctrine. Again, there is one body and one Spirit: the mystical body visible in the world as the organ of its invisible Head, the oneness of which, let it be observed, is the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace: the oneness of all who receive the reconciliation with the Father through the Son, and its seal in the communication of the Holy Ghost. Lastly, there is one hope of your calling: the unity of that heavenly aspiration which makes the pilgrim companies one in the hope of eternal blessedness. This is the fundamental, and almost the only, text on the subject, and it gives all the elements of the direct and positive Evangelical teaching concerning the unity of the Church 1 John 17:21; 2 Ephesians 4:3-6

2. If we turn to the negative or indirect teaching, we find much that is instructive on this subject. First, the omissions are remarkable. There is no prescription of a necessary uniformity according to any supposed theory: external oneness is never directly even alluded to as existing beyond an individual congregation, while, on the other hand, a certain measure of external differences and mutual independence must be assumed in order to give reality to the exhortations to unity. Secondly, the constant tone of Apostolic doctrine points to the maintenance rather of a spiritual

than of a visible oneness. This appears in the figurative language used to describe the Christian fellowship, which always shows that the only unity directly aimed at in Scripture is the mystical. It is that of His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all:1 the pleerooma of Christ, whatever the precise meaning of the word may be, must signify one pure and perfect spiritual complement of this Divine-human Person, one in His unity, or in Himself. Now that is said of the Church; and that body is never spoken of as one in any external sense. In our Lord's allegory it is the Vine2 from the unity of which dead branches are cut off: that unity is in Christ Himself and belongs to a tree of life; which strictly speaking has none but living branches. The same remarks hold good of the figure which describes the universal Church as a Temple, or House. In the final sayings of the New Testament, when external organization must have been nearly complete, we read only of spiritual oneness, not of outward uniformity. Christian fellowship is with the Father and with HisSong of Solomon 3:1-11 and that through the Spirit, which He hath given us.4 The violations of that fellowship are doctrinal and practical: he that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh,5 and he that committeth sin.6 The former is said to have gone out from us.7 There is not a word in this final document of the unity of the outward body. In the Apocalypse the seven churches are one in the central Lord who holds them in His right hand;8 nor among their offences is their violation of external unity mentioned. The divisions condemned in the New Testament as schisms are always factious or doctrinal divisions within particular churches. The overt acts of separation, according to the modern notion of heresy and schism, are not contemplated in the New Testament. The breaches of unity are breaches rather of the spirit than of the form: of the latter there are but few traces

1 Ephesians 1:23; 2 John 15:1; 3 1 John 1:3; 4 1 John 3:24; 5 1 John 4:3; 6 1 John 3:8; 7 1 John 2:19; 8 Revelation 1:20

3. Hence we may gather up these Scriptural elements into the statement that the One Church is the unity of all the congregations of believers in Christ in which the pure Gospel is preached, the sacraments duly administered, and the discipline of the Christian fellowship maintained in its purity

(1.) The basis of this unity is the common property of a sound confession of faith in Jesus. This is called holding the Head,1 or building on the one foundation.2 With this must be conjoined the unity of worship offered to the Holy Trinity through the Mediator, the Christian sacraments as the seals of admission and continuance in the Church, and the maintenance of sacred discipline 1 Colossians 2:19; 2 1 Corinthians 3:12

(2.) As to the expression of this oneness it is regarded in the New Testament as seen of God, and of Him only. He beholds the one great assembly and hears the secret harmony of what may seem to result from many discordant voices. As to man it is the object not of sight but of faith: " I believe in one holy, catholic church,"—not faith IN it, but faith that it exists—is the later expression of the Scriptural principle, This admits of its exhibiting the reality of oneness by manifestation in many ways: by an essential agreement in faith, worship, and discipline, witnessed of all men; by methods of combination for the express purpose of declaring union, and that not only by admissions of individual brotherhood, but also by acknowledgment of ecclesiastical relations; and by intercommunion and fellowship in all holy enterprises of Catholic Christian charity

(3.) The Scriptural ground of this unity is the general supervision of the Holy Spirit: The Lord knoweth them that are His in the great house; and this is the inscription on the seal of its security,

the obverse being only this, Let every one that nameth the name of the Lord depart from unrighteousness.1 In Apostolic days the presence of the Lord's inspired representatives was the bond of union among the churches; but we find no express provision for that bond after their departure. In every individual church unity is maintained by discipline, committed to the hands of responsible pastors 1 2 Timothy 2:19-20

ECCLESIASTICAL

Differences as to this attribute or note of the Church are bound up with its best and worst developments. The subject belongs strictly to ecclesiastical history; but a few hints may be noted here, having relation both to doctrine and ethics

1. It has been seen that within the Scripture there is a unity observable which is quite different from uniformity. In Israel there was indeed only one temple: no breach of unity was permitted, and the separation of the kingdoms was not sanctioned by God. The Romanist theory, fake now, was true then: the High Priest was the bond of absolute unity to the covenant people. But after the Captivity, another temple was built in Egypt; synagogues organised local centers of worship; and sects arose. Our Lord sanctioned none of the sects as such, neither did He condemn them as such: the Monachism of the Jews and the ascetic isolation of the Essenes He did not once refer to. He certainly condemned by implication the worship of Samaria, not as a violation of unity, however, but as false: ye worship ye know not what. For salvation is of the Jews.1 We naturally study with great interest all the hints of the Master's will on this most important subject; and certainly gather from some indications that it was not His purpose to bind His people in the bonds of a very rigorous uniformity. The disciples rebuked on one occasion those who followed not them; but they in turn were rebuked by their Lord. The Apostles were a bond of unity after their Master's departure. But there is no hint of a continuance of their authority as uniting the whole Church; and the council of Jerusalem was not repeated

1 John 4:22

2. Leaving the Scriptures, we find at once the tendency that has made the unity of the Church a prominent question. During the ante-Nicene and Patristic ages generally the foundations were laid of a doctrine of absolute uniformity. The growth of heresies and schisms was the first occasion of this very early idea of a mechanical unity: these two words becoming very soon fixed in their meaning as follows. HERESY is the self-willed choice of some particular error and consequent departure from the Christian Confession

Every church which renounces the fundamental doctrines of Christianity is out of the unity of Christendom: not that it must necessarily be at once cut off; the tribunal is an invisible one; and the excision is from on high. As to the outward expression of unity the violation is SCHISM: strife within the community itself, separation from it, whether by voluntary act or as cast out. In the latter case there may be a justification which shall clear the apparent breach from sinfulness. But in the Patristic age there was no thought of a justifiable schism. Three representative men may be cited as the leading exponents of these views, and of the different ways in which they were maintained. Ignatius, an Apostolical Father of the first century, laid down the principle that the one episcopate was the only bond of union: meaning, however, only that in every church the chief minister was the guarantee of order as against schism and of sound doctrine as against heresy. Irenaeus in the

second century made the One Church, as the congregation of all churches under this episcopal government, the only organ of the Holy Ghost: where we have a singular combination of visible and invisible unity. Cyprian of the third century (250), in his work De Unitate, pointed to Rome as the centre of unity, though rejecting Roman jurisdiction: a position which was very generally assumed

3. The further development of the principle that internal unity must be expressed by external uniformity belongs to Ecclesiastical History. By degrees the Roman bishop of bishops assumed to be to the whole church what each bishop was to the individual church. The ecclesiastical was conformed to the civil order, the Caesar of a temporal universal empire must have for his counterpart the spiritual Caesar, or the Vicar of Christ as the centre of unity and final appeal. The spirit of protest against this began in the East, which resented both the FILIOQUE added to the Nicene Creed and the authority by which it was added. The breach between Eastern and Western Christendom has never been healed: it remains as a standing protest against the erroneous doctrine of unity. While Rome denounces the Protestant communities as out of the pale of the one body of Christ, the Orthodox Greek Church denounces Rome as the first of all Protestant dissenters, heretics, and schismatics. In the West the Protestant Reformation utterly rejected the theory of an external unity as held by both communities, whether Catholic or Orthodox 4. A few remarks may be made upon modern tendencies in the interpretation of the note of unity since the Reformation

(1.) It is generally conceded to be impracticable to aim at oneness in the visible church save in the fundamentals of faith, worship, and discipline. It must be obvious to every dispassionate mind that there has never been since the times of the Apostles any other unity than that which God alone can discern. Eastern and Western Christendom would agree that there has been none such since the seventh century: and each despairs of the restoration of union save on terms which the other cannot accept. Among Protestant communities only one judgment ought to prevail here. There are found, however, certain Hierarchical or High-Church enthusiasts who dream of a unity which a lineal Apostolical succession of orders gives to Eastern and Western Episcopal communions. But this is the most unreal of unrealities. A compromise is attempted by those who, whether Anglican with episcopacy, or Lutheran without it, give up the hope of a universal unity, but cling to that expressed by national churches in every land. This is the religious unity of race or nation or territory. But ft can never be proved that the Head of the Church divided His kingdom, or Intended that it should be divided, territorially. The Congregational theory which admits only of voluntary aggregation of churches, and neither has nor desires any guarantee for more than that, goes to an extreme but in the right direction

(2.) But this tends to the modern correction of the notions of Heresy and Schism. There are some important principles which are now generally accepted. These two violations of unity generally go together: the airesis or heresy being self-willed choice of private interpretation in opposition to Scripture, and the schisma the following of a party. Few schisms can be named which have not been the result of doctrinal error: few leading heresies which have not issued in schisms. Here, however, there is a distinction. Heresy can never be perpetuated; but the result of schisms may. Ecclesiastical schism may be taken up by Divine wisdom into the development of the kingdom of Christ: having been in fact not schism in the sight of God, or soon losing the taint. Apparent schism may be the only cure of heresy. Many minor heresies may co-exist with holding the Head. But

where, on the one hand, there is such infidel subtraction from the faith, or, on the other, such superstitious addition to it, as neutralize the fundamentals, separation may be inevitable and lawful. Discipline may be so relaxed or perverted as to necessitate separations which are not schismatical: Dissent and Nonconformity are not necessarily and as such sinful. Schism may be the sin of the community left as well as of the community leaving. But all this rises to the higher principle that the Holy Spirit is the Giver of life corporate as well as individual. He quickeneth whom He will. The body is more than its raiment: any such act of the sovereign Spirit must aim at the more effectual growth of the Church. He thus prevents unity from degenerating into stagnant uniformity He calls them His people that were not a people, in order to provoke others to jealousy

Lastly, whenever the Spirit thus goes out of His way to divide existing churches, He never fails to authenticate His own act: as Paul among the Apostles was able to authenticate his vocation and work As to heresy or self-willed and needless schism it is still one of the works of the flesh:1 condemned of itself 1 Galatians 5:19

(3.) There are two opposite errors on the whole subject which, always observable, are very prominent in modern times. One is the overvaluation of the importance of unity, as uniformity. This is rebuked by reason, Scripture, and the evidence of the fact that the Holy Ghost does administer the work of Christ by sects and divisions. Much of the progress of the Gospel, and many of its most glorious achievements, at home and abroad, may be traced to the labors of Christian Societies to a great extent independent of each other. But undervaluation of it is equally wrong. Though variety is ordained of God, the nearer to uniformity, or at least to thorough mutual recognition, the estate of Christendom can be made the better will it be for its peace and dignity and prosperity. In due time Christ Who at His first coming made both one,1 uniting Jews and Gentiles, will blend all communions into unity, and His Church shall by His presence be in all its multitude of branches made perfect in one.2 1 Ephesians 2:14; 2 John 17:23 SANCTITY AND IMPERFECTION The Church, as the organ of the Holy Ghost, is necessarily holy. But its holiness as imputed is consistent with much imperfection; and as real and internal is only by degrees carried onwards to a perfection which will not be reached in this world

I. The meaning of agia, sancta, as applied to the Body of Christ, is the same which the term has been seen to bear as applied to individuals: with regard to both it signifies simply that which is set apart from the world and consecrated to God

1. The Church is spoken of as holy in the Divine purpose: the end proposed by the Creator. Let Us make man in Our image, after Our likeness,1 must be referred to redeemed mankind also. In this the Three Persons concur. He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world.2 Who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a people for His own.3 This final aim—to gather out of the world a people for His name—is ever kept in view by the Holy Spirit of God, in Whom ye were sealed unto the day of redemption.4 The common design of the Holy Trinity was the new creation of a perfect humanity or body of mankind: as THE CALLED, kleetoi, from the world or mass of the unregenerate into THE CHURCH, ekkleesia 1 Genesis 1:26; 2 Ephesians 1:4; 3 Titus 2:14; 4 Ephesians 4:30

2. This design is accomplished through all the means of grace. The process is spiritual and in union with Christ, Who as the Head can have only members like Himself. Hence their vocation is an holy calling.1 Of them the Lord says, I have chosen you out of the world,2 and of the Father

they are accepted in the Beloved.3 The temple of the living God,4 and the temple of the Holy Ghost5 dwelling in it, the Church is sacred: its holiness is real, though its sanctification is a process at best: that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word.6 The building, fitly framed together, formed by holy members and at the same time forming them, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord.7

1 2 Timothy 1:9; 2 John 15:19; 3 Ephesians 1:6; 42 Corinthians 6:16; 51 Corinthians 6:19; 6Ephesians 5:26; 7Ephesians 2:21

3. This design is supposed by anticipation and in prophecy to be accomplished. Always over the visible and imperfect church hovers the image of a sanctified Ideal already in heavenly places in Christ Jesus.1 Thus in the design of redemption, in the process on earth, and in the glorious result, already the congregation of Christ is before the mind and in the purpose of God holy

1 Ephesians 2:6 II. More particularly, the holiness of the one church is that of an external imputation; of an internal process; and of the gradual approach of these to coincidence, never perfect in this world, but to be perfected at the coming of Christ

1. There is a relative and imputed sanctity. As holiness unto the Lord was stamped on the bells of the horses,1 so all in what our Lord called My house2 is impressed with a certain character of holiness down to its very dust. Hence all that pertains to the outward and visible community—the assembly and the building itself in which they gather, the Divine service, the table, the sacraments—are all among ta osia, the holy things.3 This is not affected by the unholiness that lingers still in the external fellowship. The Epistles are written to the companies of saints,4 among whom, however, are many whose unholiness is rebuked. Our Lord's own Catholic Epistles are written to the churches which are His and yet needed much amendment: until He removes the candlestick out of his place,5 it shines upon a holy company. Jerusalem at the worst was still the holy city.6 But this is only a relative sanctity, and avails not of itself, being alone

1 Zechariah 14:20; 2 Matthew 21:13; 3 Acts 13:34; 4 1 Corinthians 1:2; 5 Revelation 2:5; Revelation 2:7; 6 Matthew 27:53

2. There is an internal and real sanctity, which inheres in the body, being derived from the sanctity of the individual members of the mystical fellowship, never wanting in any community that holds the Head. Their life, aim, and communion are holy; the sanctity of the Church is really their sanctity; and of them the Creed says: I believe in the communion of saints. This holiness is matter of faith; it is also imperfect necessarily: for whatever perfection of sanctity individual members may reach cannot be imputed to the whole body unless all share it alike

3. The internal and external are gradually becoming one, in the whole Church as in the individual Christian. Within the universal community, reckoned holy, there is going on the silent, ceaseless operation of a sanctifying grace: by love, by discipline, by melting, and by burning, the Church as a whole, and every branch and congregation, is brought gradually towards perfect purity. Hence the importance during the interval of process that we should remember St. Paul's twofold seal. The Lord knoweth them that are His:1 whatever the anomalies, while the candlestick remains we may have perfect confidence in the Divine discrimination of His own. Let everyone that nameth the name of the Lord depart from iniquity: he that in the visible fellowship puts away sin, and lives in holiness, may also have rejoicing in himself when oppressed by the errors in doctrine and

variations in practice observable in the GREAT HOUSE. We have this double watchword to fall back on. One inscription on the seal bids us remember that God discerns His own from all others. The obverse inscription tells us that we must insure our own salvation: according to our Lord's principle, What is that to thee? Follow thou Me!2 But St. Paul's large and tolerant watchword must be somewhat limited in the case of any one community. In the individual church the case is different It is not said of this, let both grow together until the harvest.3 On the contrary, an effectual discipline is appointed: pastoral oversight must see to it that disorderly members be reproved, and, if persisting in evil, put away; while the injunction is laid upon Christians, Withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly.4 1 2 Timothy 2:19; 2 John 21:22; 3 Matthew 13:30; 4 2 Thessalonians 3:6

III. This leads to the consideration of two currents of error which this Note of the Church detects: the exaggeration of the relative and of the absolute sanctity respectively

1. As to the former, many circumstances have had the effect of limiting the sanctity of the body to its outward fellowship. The notion of an inherent virtue in the sacraments, especially when these sacraments were multiplied so as to hedge in all life, tended to externalize the idea of religion generally, and of the ordinances of Christian fellowship in particular. So also the early and unregulated alliance of Christianity with the State had the same effect, as the perversion of what was in itself not necessarily evil. Whether the developed Roman theory, that the Church is invested with the supreme authority over the world, or the Erastian, that it is only an organ of the State, or the Latitudinarian, that the Church and State are several aspects of the same thing, the evidence of fact, multiplied into endless instances, goes to prove that the union, as it has been generally seen in Christendom, has always had this evil issue. Neglect of discipline, one of the worst results of bringing into too close relations the world and the Church, has tended the same way. The Lord's Take these things hence!1 gave a law and established a precedent too soon forgotten. The illustrations of this are endless, but they carry us too deeply for our present purpose into ecclesiastical history

1 John 2:16

2. The external sanctity has sometimes been undervalued. Some schisms in the early Church—Montanism in Phrygia, Novatianism in Rome, Donatism in Africa—were the result of undue rigor in rooting out the tares: the extremest fanaticism was the consequence In more recent times Puritanism, whether on the Continent or in England, has pushed its high principle too far. Hence Modern Congregationalism, its lineal descendant and representative in this country, counts no sanctity of the external Church as valid to establish a Christian character or availing for membership without the profession of conscious faith. The Baptists go further, and refuse to admit that the dedication of children to God in baptism confers on them any even external relation to the Church as holy. This at least, is their principle when carried to its issues 3. The true theory seems to be that which aims at the medium

(1.) All who approve themselves believers in Christ, and who, whether as adults or as children, are baptized, belong to the external body, and are entitled to all its privileges

Due respect to the outward and visible church requires the recognition of all baptized and consistent members of it, without demanding personal testimony of conscious experience

Bat the internal sanctity of the fellowship has its rights. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the seal of the communion of saints, and their note of profession among men, must be guarded with care, its approaches being fenced in every possible way suggested by pastoral vigilance and mutual watchfulness. In some manner communicants ought to be examined and approved one by one

(2.) The method of accomplishing this has varied with every age and almost with every community. By many of the later national churches it has been too often entirely neglected: public warnings and confessions being only to a slight degree reinforced by private investigation. The CLASS-MEETING among the Methodists is their method of meeting one of the greatest difficulties of the times. It does not profess to impose a new condition of membership in the Christian Church. It is only one out of many forms— certainly the most widespread and permanent—which the Ecclesiola in Ecclesia, or the society within the Church, has assumed. No religious community has long maintained its vigor and purity without some such expedient. This one in particular honors the Church's note of external sanctity by admitting freely every anxious applicant on the sole condition that he as a baptized member of the Church of Christ is desirous to flee from the wrath to come and to find salvation in the name of Jesus. It brings everyone under pastoral supervision, direct or indirect: indirect, as the leaders of these classes are themselves part of the minister's flock, and direct, inasmuch as these little companies are under the discipline of a quarterly visitation. This institution provides the means of mutual social edification, in addition to the general means of grace, and thus does much to promote both the external and the internal sanctity of the community: the external, because it tends to give more reality and dignity to the outward fellowship of the Christian Church; the internal, because it brings all the members under the influence of an edifying mutual exhortation and prayer. Apart from its modern name, this form of fellowship may be traced almost up to the times of the Apostles VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE

These attributes of the organic fellowship of Christ have played a prominent part in ecclesiastical controversy. But there are none which are clearer in their elementary principles

I. The Church is, as the Redeemer's mystical body, animated by His Spirit, essentially invisible. In its deepest and most comprehensive sense it is a spiritual and unseen reality; and therefore an ideal or the mystical fellowship. But, in its manifestation as the kingdom upon earth it is no other than the invisible Church taking visible form. Lastly, in its eternal consummation the invisible and the visible will be one

1. My kingdom is not of this world:1 this declared to Pilate as the representative of those outside the spiritual and super-terrestrial character of the community; afterwards, within the circle of His disciples, the Lord dwelt upon the same aspect of His fellowship. The entire strain of the Final Prayer presents before God a mystical and invisible body, with hardly an allusion to any other than that. This, in the language of St. Paul to the Ephesians, is the body of Christ, and the fullness of Him that filleth all in all.2 It is as an organic body spiritually organized and is invisible as its Head Himself is, like every faithful member, hid with Christ in God.3 1 John 18:36; 2 Ephesians 4:1; Ephesians 4:23; 3 Colossians 3:3

2. But this language concerning the mystical fellowship is addressed to a visible community as concerning itself. St. Paul does not speak of the Saints which are at Ephesus as distinct from the Faithful in Christ Jesus, though the whole question of visible and invisible lies in that distinction.

The entire New Testament goes upon the assumption that every extant community is the earthly embodiment of the kingdom of heaven. In this the servants are faithful to the teaching of their Master, "Who taught the unity, though not identity, of the visible and the invisible communions. The only two recorded instances of our Lord's use of the word illustrate the unity and the difference of the two. Upon this rock I will build My church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it:1 here is the foundation of the invisible Church which is the temple built by Christ spiritual and eternal, yet built up by human fellow-laborers with Himself: here the mystical idea is prominent though not exclusive of the other. That same Church is also shut in and the offender is in the midst, and discipline enforced, before the spiritual presence of Jesus who says: Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst:2 here the visible and concrete reality is prominent. But the two churches are one. So also the High-priestly prayer, which consecrates the spiritual temple, is uttered over a body that had just been bound together in visible sacramental unity. To return, however, from our Lord to His Apostles, St. Paul dilates upon the administration of gifts in a visible ministry, and then glides into the increase of the invisible body. So the great house is a visible one, but it has an eternal, invisible foundation; as its seal testifies, the Lord knoweth them that are His:3 and the Lord alone 1 Matthew 16:18; 2 Matthew 18:20; 3 2 Timothy 2:19-20

3. The Apocalypse gives us a clear vision of the visible and invisible reduced to final and eternal unity: mystical still, but eternally visible as one glorified organic whole, the Church is a distinct spiritual counterpart of the Lord Himself. Moreover He is the Bridegroom, and His Church the Bride adorned for her husband,1 in the last exhibition of both which the Scriptures contain 1 Revelation 21:2

II. The application of this double Note in historical theology concerns only the relative importance of the two ideas of visible and invisible. No confession has ever denied the reality of either. The differences between them have concerned only the results flowing from the undue preponderance of one or the other

1. Romanism exalts the visibility almost to the suppression of the invisibility: not, however, denying the latter. It teaches that there is " one Ruler of the church invisible, Christ; and one Ruler of the visible, the successor of St. Peter." The spiritual body has a place in its interior theology, but is not, by any means, a governing idea: its theory is constructed in entire independence of the mystical reality, which is acknowledged indeed to be its crown and glory, but only in another state and to the eye of faith. Hence, it makes one of the many notes of the true church —of which a large number is sometimes reckoned—Exclusiveness: there is no salvation beyond the pale of the one visible institution

2. The Protestant idea strives to unite the two attributes: but giving always the priority and pre-eminence to the invisibility. The Roman Dogma will have nothing to do with an invisible church apart from the visible: the Protestant rejects the thought of a visible which is not created by the invisible to be its organ. The Reformed Confessions differed from the Lutheran only so far as their doctrine of election obliged them to differ. In the former the elect are the true fellowship; but the visible church is a holy institution "to depart from which," in Calvin's words, "is to deny Christ." Calvin says, further: " God substitutes the judgment of charity, in which we acknowledge those to be true members of the Church who confess the same God with us in profession of faith, in

goodness of life, and in participation of sacraments." The Lutheran and the Reformed were agreed at the outset as to the close connection between the congregation visible and the body politic; but the close alliance of Church and State is not so generally accepted by their modern representatives

3. Much of the differences between the modern communions results from variations in theory as to the possibility of bringing the visible and the invisible into coincidence or unity. Here are two opposite extremes, and a middle way between them. The Broad- Church theory holds that the distinction should never be made, except in extreme cases of apostasy and excommunication: the whole world, waiting for baptism, is as it were the visible church, and the invisible must be left with God. The stricter Congregationalist theories strive to limit it as much as possible to authenticated professors, and aim very closely at making the visible the measure of the invisible in every society. This has introduced the modern distinction between the church and the congregation. Lastly, there has been a compromise, adopted under various forms among various communities: that of the Society within the church, which is not a theory of the mystical within the visible body, but the attempt to save the general fellowship from some of the evils which are inseparable from the constitution and working of the visible fellowship as the Apostles left it: an attempt that in some form or other has been made in almost every earnest and faithful communion CATHOLIC AND LOCAL The ascription of catholicity to the Christian body dates from a very early time. The term catholic means universal; and when local is added, as its counterpart, the two expressions signify that the one church of the Redeemer, His body on earth, has such a universality in its design and destiny as is consistent with the local independence of individual churches

Nothing more is meant than this; but we shall find that the word catholic has a very different application in ecclesiastical history

1. The testimony of Scripture on this subject is very simple. The ancient church, Hebrew and Jewish, was strictly local and national. All who might enter it from other lands must submit to what was a Jewish rite: retaining their own nationality as men, they must as worshippers become Jews. But the ancient Scriptures predicted a future religious fellowship which should embrace all nations, and be independent of everything national The New Testament explains what in this matter the old predictions left indistinct. In the Gospels almost all the discourses and parables bearing on this subject dwell much on this enlargement of the kingdom: it is in fact hardly ever left out down to the last commission In the later New Testament the theory is that of a church which is to be diffused through all nations; and the labors of the Apostles are directed accordingly. But, while thus catholic, the local community meets us everywhere. We read of the church,1 that is, of Jerusalem, and the churches of Galatia. The last time the word is mentioned, it is in connection with distinct and independent branches of the one universal Fellowship: the seven churches which are in Asia2 being a sevenfold unity 1 Acts 2:47; 2 Galatians 1:2

2. The earliest use of the term Catholic, in the middle of the second century, probably introduced into it a meaning that the Scriptures do not refer to. The word was used to distinguish the one universal and faithful body from the fragmentary companies of heretics and schismatics which were therefore not parts of the catholic body. That meaning the word has never lost: the Great Majority. But, since the division between East and West, and the plain fact that the majority of professing Christians is on the side of the dissentients from the see of St. Peter, the term has been

conventionally used by Rome to signify simply the one and only church, outside of which there is no salvation. The Eastern communities do not so much affect the term, preferring that of Orthodox and Apostolic

3. The Christian Church may be regarded as CATHOLIC: designed and adapted for universal diffusion; and embracing the totality of those communions which maintain the great truths in which the essence of Christianity lies. The term, therefore, ought never to be used of any particular community. The Church is also LOCAL or Particular: it exists in independent and even isolated forms, whether as it respects individual, or connexional, or national bodies; and it may, holding the catholic verities, maintain in its Confession truths that are not catholic, and adopt un-catholic usages, without impairing its catholicity. For the one church of Christ is at once adapted for every variety of mankind, and influenced in its turn by every variety of human life. It is not more certainly Universal than it is Particular APOSTOLIC AND CONFESSIONAL The New Testament to some extent sanctions the attribute of Apostolicity. After our Lord had chosen the Twelve—distinguished by this number whether as disciples or as Apostles,1 — He declared that upon them, represented by St. Peter, and proclaiming a sound confession, He would build His church. To these He entrusted the keys, gave His commission, and promised the special effusion of His Spirit. St. Peter, the representative Apostle, was the instrument of laying the foundation of the new community both among the Jews and among the Gentiles. From the Day of Pentecost the disciples continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship.2 When St. Paul wag added to the company, he became, as they were, an absolute authority under the Lord; and it is he who says that the members of Christ's body are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets.3The same pre-eminence is given to them in the Apocalypse. Leaving the New Testament, we soon find the term Apostolic used as a note of the visible Christian body 1 Matthew 10:1-2; 2 Acts 2:42; 3 Ephesians 2:20

1. At first the application of it was sound: the true church traced its institution, under God, to the Apostolical foundation, and maintained the Apostolical faith and traditions as yet un-corrupted. But gradually the theory arose which merged the authority of the Twelve in that of Peter, and the Church was regarded as Apostolic so far as it was one with the see of Rome. But the primacy of Peter, only representative in the New Testament, ceased altogether when he departed; and thus this application of the note is convicted of being unscriptural 2. The Apostolic note is applied, altogether independently of Rome, by many churches in the form, of Apostolical succession. That there is an uninterrupted succession of ministers which the Divine eye can trace up to the Apostles' times, there can be no doubt. But it is utterly impossible to prove that in any part of the world there is a ministry that can trace its orders up through episcopal hands to the Apostles. This theory of the transmission of the Apostolic authority is closely connected with a wider theory of sacramental grace, which is elsewhere examined. As belonging to the Apostolic note, the doctrine of succession has no place in sound theology: at least in its modern conventional sense

3. Another error—based on a theory curiously opposite to the last—interprets the Note thus: that the true church is one in which the Spirit, after the long pretermission of ages, has restored the Apostolate, with the original gifts and prerogatives of speaking new tongues and other miraculous endowments. But the Scripture does not make the existence of the Christian fellowship dependent on the permanence of the Apostolic office: on the contrary, St. Paul and St. John write as contemplating a state of things in which they and their prerogative would be absent

4. During the last few centuries all Evangelical communions, not in bondage to this idea of succession, have held that the Apostolical doctrine and discipline may be maintained in common by communities which on minor points, not absolutely determined by the Apostles, differ according to their various standards of confession. Hence we may lay down our dogma: the Church is Apostolic, as being still ruled by the Apostolical authority living in the writings of the Apostles, that authority being the standard of appeal in all the Confessions that HOLD THE HEAD INDEFECTIBLE AND MUTABLE

Both these attributes are clearly given to the one church in Holy Scripture. They refer to the perpetuity of the Christian community and of the Christian faith delivered to it

1. As to the former, it is enough to quote our Lord's words on two occasions: when He first spoke of His church, and when He last spoke of it. The gates of Hades shall not prevail against it.1 He saw in the great futurity the anti-church—the kingdom of falsehood, vanity, and death, the power of Hades—striving from age to age to dissolve His kingdom, but in vain. It cannot fall; for, like the faith of every true member of it, it is founded upon a Rock.2 In His own Epistles in the Apocalypse, however, He expressly threatens Ephesus to remove thy candlestick out of its place:3 that is, to extinguish the light, and quench the existence, of an individual church. His prophecy was fulfilled. Thus we have His authority for believing that the Christian Church shall never fail, but that Christian churches may pass away 1 Matthew 16:18; 2 Matthew 7:23 : 3 Revelation 2:3

2. As to the latter, the perpetuity of the Faith, it needs no special evidence beyond the assurance I am with you alway.1 Our Lord is the Truth;2 the Faith is one with Him; and He is to be glorified by the Spirit in the Church showing the things of Christ and guiding the Apostles into all the truth.3 We need no further witnesses. On the other hand, that churches may corrupt the faith, in part and in whole, and become apostate, is proved by a catena of evidence going up to the Apostolical foundations which did so corrupt it These testimonies of Scripture establish our dogma: that the Christian Church, in its unity, is at once and while it is extant below both indefectible and mutable 1 Matthew 28:20; 2 John 14:6; 3 John 16:13 MILITANT AND TRIUMPHANT

1. There is no necessity for any illustration, either from history or Scripture, of these last correlative attributes. Here at length all exposition, all confessions, all communions agree. The same one body which is waging war with principalities and powers, slowly winning and hardly maintaining its conquests, is at the same time triumphant, rejoicing in Paradise with its Head in anticipation of that deeper joy, that joy of their Lord, into which all shall at once enter in the end of the days. The Church militant expects its most severe conflicts yet in the future; but the apocalyptic agonies shall at the set time be swallowed up in the song of eternal triumph. These two attributes are the most comprehensive as they are the last. And, as they belong to the one church, so in a certain sense they are themselves one. We hear the Apostles say: Now thanks be unto God, which always leadeth us in triumph in Christ!1 The warfare and the victory go on together, as we hear in the Apocalypse, where the toiling assembly below hears the doxology of the general assembly above, and all but joins in it: like the prophet Isaiah in the typical vision of the mystical temple.2 1 2 Corinthians 2:14; 2 Isaiah 6:1-13

2. The measure of the sympathy between the militant and the triumphant fellowship is clearly defined in Scripture; but the early Church soon began to chafe at its restrictions From Origen onward may be traced an ever-widening current of doctrine, the issue of which was the creation of

a new intermediate estate of the Christian company, not precisely militant and not yet triumphant, that of Purgatory. Connected with this was the enlargement of the article on the Communion of Saints, so as to include the good offices of prayer between the living and the departed: intercession for the dead in Purgatory on the part of saints on earth; on the part of saints in heaven, intercession both for the dead in Purgatory and the militant living. This department of theology is simply an addition to Scripture, the teaching of which, as we have seen, and shall see again, altogether repudiates it THE CHURCH AS AN INSTITUTE FOR WORSHIP The Church of Christ is not only His representative Body on earth, it is also the Temple of Divine service, continuing and perfecting the worship of the past. This service may be studied under two aspects, as it includes offering presented to God, and blessing received from Him. The former embraces the entire ordinance of worship, with its nature, reasons, and observances; the latter embraces the means of grace, Common Prayer, the Word, and Sacraments. These, however, are really one, and their relations to each other as one are of great importance. Both require for their realization the institution of the Evangelical ministry. We have then now before us the Divine worship, the Means of Grace, and the Christian Ministry As to the unity of worship and the means of grace, it must be remembered that both are taken in their widest meaning. Worship includes all that belongs to the service offered by men to God, as He is the Object of adoration and the Source of blessing: including praise and prayer in all their forms. Communion with Him, therefore, is the channel of all benediction; and we may speak generally of waiting upon God in the means of grace. But this latter term (Media Gratise) has also its technical signification, as designating the appointed and specific channels through which the Divine Spirit pours His influences into the Church. Into the Church: for, while all doxology and all benediction is individual, we are now regarding them as ordinances of the congregation. Their congregational character is represented by the ministry, which must be regarded as an institution for the corporate body, affecting individuals only as being members in particular

DIVINE WORSHIP The worship of the Christian Church may be regarded in its Divine principles and in its human arrangements. As to the former, its object is the revealed Trinity; its form is Mediatorial, through the Son Incarnate, by the Holy Spirit; its attributes are spirituality, simplicity, purity, and reverent decorum; its seasons are the Christian Sabbath preeminently, and all times of holy assembly. As to the latter, it is left to the congregation itself to determine the minor details, according to the pattern shown in the Scripture: this latitude extending to the order of worship, its set times, its forms, liturgical or otherwise, and its decent ceremonial generally THE DIVINE ORDER The Divine and permanent laws of the perfect economy of public worship prescribe the following general principles

1. That always and everywhere the TRIUNE GOD be its object, as now fully revealed in the Christian dispensation. All homage or adoration or gratitude must, virtually or actually, pay its tribute to the Three-One Name; and whatever acts of worship are offered to One Divine Person must be offered to That One in the unity of the Other Two. The God of the Christian temple is the Same Who in the ancient temple received the threefold Doxology and bestowed the threefold Benediction

2. That the stated form of all worship, whether of praise or prayer, must be, either informally or avowedly, MEDIATORIAL. God the Father, the Representative of the Trinity, is to be addressed only through the mediation of the Incarnate Son, Whose intercessory office, based on His one

sacrifice, has special reference to our privilege of boldness to enter into the holiest.1 And through Him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.2 That Spirit of grace and of supplications3 alone inspires the energy of intelligent and acceptable worship; and His influence is equally present in every assembly from the least to the greatest. These are the full mediatorial preparations, in heaven and upon earth, —there through the High Priest and here through His Spirit, —for the perfect devotions of the Church below. We find this Divine order observed in all the prayers and praises of the later New Testament. In harmony with this law we arrange all our liturgical worship

And, though we do not presume to add the formula of mediatorial words to the Lord's Player, we silently present it through the name of Him Who gave it to us 1 Hebrews 10:19; 2 Ephesians 2:18; 3 Zechariah 12:10

3. The preparations of the heart in man, also, are from the Lord.1 It is the first condition of Divine worship that it be SPIRITUAL. God is a Spirit: and they that worship Him must warship Him in spirit and in truth.2 This law of Christ is the law of all the Scripture; but He thus solemnly re-enacted it, as He re-enacted the law of love, to show its supreme importance: it demands the heart of man as the shrine of worship, sanctify Christ as Lard in your hearts;3 it forbids all representations of the Supreme save those which He has appointed and are spiritual in their meaning; and it reduces all externals of service to their true place. PURITY also is an essential of this worship: the pure in heart4 in His temple see God, and none really approach Him, though found in the congregation, whose motives are not sincere; without wrath and disputing.5 ORDER is another Divine law of worship: God is not the author of confusion, akatastasias. And His will is that all things be done decently and in order,6 eusheemonoos kai kata taxin. In the presence of God a sacred decorum is the rule as well of nature as of grace. Again, worship must be COMPLETE in its tribute to the Supreme: in the adoration of His name which is Praise; in the remembrance of His mercies, which is Thanksgiving; in the acknowledgment of unworthiness, which is Confession; in the expression of dependence, which is Prayer; in the oblation of Charity, which is Intercession. Lastly, worship must be INDIVIDUAL. There is in Christianity, as our Lord teaches it, no representative worship but His own; and in that we are united with Him. The devotion is the Church's devotion, but its harmony is the blending of the melodies of all its individual members not one of whom is forgotten 1 Proverbs 16:1; 2 John 4:24; 3 1 Peter 3:15; 4 Matthew 5:8; 5 1 Timothy 2:8; 6 1 Cor. 16:33,40

4. Amongst the permanent Divine ordinances of worship must be reckoned THE SABBATH as its chief and representative season. This institution was an appointment of God from the beginning of time to that end. Rest from labor was a physical design subserved in connection with a spiritual design: that man might cease from every other occupation in order to hold communion with his Creator. This was the supreme purpose of the day; and as such bound up with all the Old-Testament regulations of religious service. Christianity has retained the institution as belonging to Divine worship; but, by the same authority which gave the original law, has modified it. Its connection with the Jewish sabbatical cycle ended, and therefore its place as a covenant sign between Jehovah and the peculiar people. Its original purpose to commemorate the creation and bear witness to the government of the One God was retained; but, as the new creation of mankind in Christ Jesus had more fully revealed the Triune God, the day of our Lord's resurrection, the first day of the week, became the Christian Sabbath, or Lord's Day. The special relation of the day to the worship of the Church, apart from its place in the Moral Law, is to be

found in the opportunity it affords of full public assembly, generally impossible at any other time, with which the continuance of religion in the world is vitally connected. To sum up, the Lord's Day in the Christian Church is the great season of worship and of assembling to worship; it retains its original design of commemorating creation, it adds the festival of redemption, and it periodically suspends this world's labor to anticipate the worship of heaven. Some points in this general statement require expansion

(1.) It has been doubted whether the account in Genesis asserts the institution of the Sabbath at that time: God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it1 may, it is said, be proleptical. But the obvious intention of the narrative is historical; there are also indications of the hebdomadal division of time2 throughout the early books; and our Lord's testimony is that the Sabbath was made forMan 1:3 Hence we find the institution referred to as one that had been familiarly known before the Mosaic law was given on Sinai: Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy.4 1 Genesis 2:3; 2 Genesis 8:10-11; Genesis 29:27-28; 3 Mark 2:27; 4 Exodus 20:8

(2.) So far as the Sabbath was introduced into the ceremonial law, and was made the basis of a Sabbatic cycle of days; so far as it became a sacrament of the old law, commemorating the redemption from Egypt, a sign between Me and you throughout your generations;1 that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you,2 and fenced about by severe enactments; —it is abolished in Christianity. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a feast day, or a new moon, or a sabbath day.3 1 Exodus 31:13; 2 Jeremiah 17:20-27; 3 Colossians 2:16

(3.) The new ordinance of the Sabbath in the Gospel was given by Christ Himself, the Lord also of the Sabbath.1 Before His passion He dealt with it as with all His institutions, by preliminary indications of His future will. He condemned false interpretations, while He included it in the law which He did not come to destroy.2 By His example and precept He relaxed its severity. With His resurrection began His formal appointment of the First day, and with the Pentecost He finally ratified it. In the interim we may suppose that He enacted by word what in His majesty He had sanctioned by act. Hence we find the first day, as the Lord's Day, hallowed throughout the New Testament: the last tribute uniting the Resurrection and the Pentecost: I was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day.3 To use St Paul's word on another occasion, the law of the Christian sabbath is not of men, neither by man, not of the Church nor by the Church, but by Jesus Christ.4 1 Mark 2:28; 2 Matthew 5:17; 3 Revelation 1:10; 4 Galatians 1:1

(4.) It is, so to speak, the sacrament of holy time in the Evangelical economy. The first day of the week sanctifies all the days which follow, but it retains its symbolical meaning. It is the day of holy convocation, concerning which it is said, pre-eminently though not solely, not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together.1 As Baptism is a sign of the severance between the world of the unregenerate and the church of the renewed, and as the Eucharist is a standing memorial of the redeeming Atonement, and both till He come,2 so the Holy Day is an abiding memorial of the permanent obligation of congregational worship. Hence it is one of the three Dominical institutes: the LORD'S HOUSE, the LORD'S SUPPER, the LORD'S DAY, TEE KURIAKEE HEEMERA 1 Hebrews 10:25; 2 1 Corinthians 11:26

(5.) Lastly, this general view of the Sabbath in relation to worship connects it with the Church, though it is scarcely right to number it among the INSTITUTIONS OF CHRISTIANITY. It is an

institution of the Christianity that is as old as the Creation. But this connects it with the Moral Law, where, as a positive enactment, it is of perpetual obligation in he Ethics, not of the Church only, but of all religion. The Sabbath as an ordinance for worship is the day which assembles the congregation; but in that worship itself the injunction of the Sabbath is read as one of the precepts of the eternal code of morality. What its spiritual interpretation is as a permanent law for mankind is a question of ethics, and has already been considered as such. At present we have considered it in its relation to Divine service THE HUMAN FORMS

Public worship is left, as to its form, to the discretion of the congregation, subject, however, to the authority of the Divine laws, and guided by the usage of Scripture. The questions that here arise are not strictly included in dogmatic theology: they therefore need only slight indication

1. The rights of the laws already laid down being reserved, the Church may appoint times and seasons and places of religious service. There is no restriction: the Lord's Supper itself is not limited to any certain day. There is no hour that may not be feet apart. Daily service, and canonical hours, are not in themselves evil, save in connection with superstitions, and as tending to absorb family and private worship. Days of Thanksgiving and of Fasting have the plenary sanction of Scripture. But Saints' days have not that authority; and, although much may be said in favor of making the names of our Lord's inspired servants prominent in the service, it is expedient to abstain. There is but a step, as the history of the corruptions of Christianity shows, between this and the Invocation of Saints. As to places, there is no Temple or Sanctuary: this word is reserved for the spiritual community or body of the Church, and the regenerate spirit of the Christian. In a certain sense there is a House of God, but wherever the congregation may meet there is, in the truest sense, the House of Prayer: Whose house are we.1 1 Hebrews 3:6

2. As to the arrangements of Divine service, there is the same latitude. The law of Decency and Order requires that the worship be regulated, and that no room be left for caprice. The relations of worship, and sacrament, and preaching must be arranged by the community. As to the much-vexed question of LITURGICAL PRAYER, it may, at least, be said that its use is within the prerogative of the congregation. The Savior gave the germ of it in His sacred pattern, in His sanction of the Temple and Synagogue service and hymns, and in His sacramental institutes. It has been one of the most universal usages of Christendom; its abuses do not discredit its use; it approves its value in experience, both as insuring the completeness of worship and by aiding tranquil devotion; virtually it enters into all extant services; and, as supplementing while not superseding spontaneous or rather un-liturgical prayers, it may with assurance be both practiced and defended 3. As to the superadded ceremonials of public worship, there is hardly the same latitude The jurisdiction of the Church here, or its power to ordain ceremonies, is attended with great difficulty. We have not now to decide between the hard requirement that forgets everything but the purely spiritual nature of the worshipper and the opposite extreme that panders to all his senses. Neither of these can be right. There is a spirit in worshipping man, or he could not worship the Invisible; and he is also flesh and blood, or he could not worship in public assemblies. There is a simple aesthetical vesture of Divine service without which it ought not to appear before God, without which it cannot commend itself to man. But what is now conventionally called Ritualism must be entirely condemned; that is to say, the introduction of symbols not ordained by the Head of the Church: symbols in the architecture of the building, in the dress of the officiating minister, and especially in the conduct of the worship itself. It tends to dishonor Holy Scripture, by making

ceremonials teach doctrines that the Word of God alone should teach: in fact, Ritualism is another form of the Oral Tradition which is made co-ordinate with Scripture as the teaching authority. It endangers the dignity of the Sacraments, which, as the sole elements of ritual given us in a religion that closed the ritual temple, should be rigidly guarded in their simplicity as the Savior left them: whereas the ritual superadded to them in later times teaches principles and applications never contemplated by the Founder of Christianity. And what is called the ritualistic spirit dishonors the Spirit of devotion by such numberless and ever-varying appeals to the senses as distract the soul from its one function. Concerning such additions of men's will-worship the Lord of the Temple says still: Take these things hence!1

1 John 2:16 THE MEANS OF GRACE As an institute of worship the Church of Christ has its ordinary channels for the communication of the influences of the Holy Ghost to the souls of men. These are the Media Gratiae, or MEANS OF GRACE. Though the Spirit is not bound to these, they are " generally necessary to salvation." They are not, however, equally and in the same sense necessary. The Word of God and Prayer are unitedly and severally what may be called the absolute and universal means: as such they may be first discussed. The sacraments are economical means, distinct from the former, yet entirely dependent upon them for their virtue THE SUPREME MEANS: THE WORD AND PRAYER

These are the supreme means as they are the basis of all: they give their virtue to the ordinances of the Church, including the sacraments. They are united: the Word gives the warrant to prayer and all its objects; Prayer is the instrument which makes the Word effectual. But as means of grace they may be regarded separately THE WORD The Word of God in the Scriptures contains the whole compass of that spiritual truth which the Holy Spirit uses as His instrument for the communication of every influence on which the salvation of man depends. As the revelation of God's law He uses it for conviction; as the Gospel promise He uses it for salvation; as the depository of ethical truth He uses it for sanctification through all morality and the discipline of holy life Let us view this in the light of Scripture itself; and then glance at ancient and current divergences

I. The doctrine of the Word concerning itself is that it is the universal channel of grace; that it is not this of itself, through any inherent efficacy, but as the organ of the Holy Ghost; and that its efficacy is nevertheless in a certain sense inherent, as the Spirit's instrument, though it may be resisted. These topics have been discussed, in their application, under the Administration of Redemption. Their bearing on the Word as chief among the means of grace may, however, be briefly considered

1. The sufficiency of Scripture is declared throughout both Testaments. The praises of the law of the Lord abound in the Old Testament, especially in the Psalms. One of them expatiates on the subject by taking all the ten names given to the Law and applying them to every phase of human need and religious experience.1 In the New Testament we have not one passage only, but a pervasive testimony. What St. Paul says of the Scriptures generally, that they make wise unto salvation,2 and are profitable for every function of grace, for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness,3 must be true of the supreme Scripture, the words of Christ, which are and comprise in themselves all the truth. He therefore prays, Sanctify them through Thy truth: Thy Word is truth.4 1 Psalms 119:1-176; 2 2 Timothy 3:15-16; 3 John 16:13; 4 John 17:17

2. The fallen estate of man forbids the thought that the mere presentation of truth should save him. He has an organ or faculty to receive it, for it is as much adapted to his soul's need as bread is to the need of his body; but the organ or faculty itself needs quickening

Hence the inherent power of the Word requires the influence of the Spirit to make it effectual. The Apostle Paul declares that his preaching was in demonstration of the Spirit and of power1 generally; but he also declares that the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually judged.2 The language or alphabet of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost must be taught to him who shall understand His consecutive and general teaching

He appeals, as the Lord appealed: why do ye not understand My speech (lalian)? even because ye cannot hear My word (logon).3 A man must submit to the doctrine of sin generally, which is hearing Christ's word or testimony concerning Himself and the sinner's relation to Him, before he can receive the full exposition of that doctrine, as it is salvation 1 1 Corinthians 2:4; 2 1 Corinthians 2:14; 3 John 8:43

3. But there is an inherent efficacy in Scripture, as applied by the Spirit. It is the universal means of grace, though men may resist it. The Word of God is as efficacious as it is universal and sufficient. It is its inherent efficacy that detects unbelief and convicts it: it is not only effectual in saving, but in condemning also. It is the same Gospel power of God which is a savor of death unto death, and a savor of life unto life.1 The Scriptural doctrine of the Divine Word as the means of grace will not allow it ever to be made of none effect.2 It is an instrument that never fails. Regarded as the Word spoken to mankind, it cannot be without its power. The Spirit is never absent from the Word: in it He lives and moves, and through it He sheds an infinite variety of influences on all who either reject or receive it, Regarded as the means of grace within the Church, it has a sacred, specific, and always present grace accompanying every truth and every promise. The Spirit is in the Truth, as the virtue was and is in Christ: ready for impartation to every touch of faith The self-evidencing energy of the Bible is its sure credential. No living man can say that it has utterly failed to find him out, and move his inmost being, and work upon his deepest convictions 1 2 Corinthians 2:16; 2 Matthew 15:6 II. It will be enough to indicate some more or less prevalent errors belonging to two entirely opposite types

1. There has never been wanting a tendency to make the Scriptures sufficient of themselves, without any supernatural accompanying influence, to effect the salvation of men. The ancient Pelagians and semi-Pelagians regarded the Word of God as the intellectual and moral discipline which best suits the spiritual nature of man, its honest use leading sincere inquirers to perfection. As human nature retains its original elements unimpaired, its natural powers are supposed to be sufficient under the influence of truth to guide to salvation. Modern Rationalism has the same general estimate of the Word of God: not regarding it as in any specific sense the means of grace, but only as one among many instruments of moral discipline

2. The highest Mysticism of every age seeks through means to rise above means and become dead to them. To the more Scriptural mystics of every communion the Word* is to be valued by its substance of truth; which exerts its influence upon the mind, but only in order to raise it to the higher intuition of God. Meditation on the principles and truths of the Word leads to Contemplation which leaves all words, thoughts, and images behind This is the line beyond which Mysticism

becomes unsafe

3. The doctrine which makes the Divine sovereignty its supreme principle holds the Word to be the means of an absolute and irresistible grace. Whatever effect it produces is produced by the effectual operation of One who cannot be resisted. The Holy Ghost, as a personal Spirit, free in all His acts, and applying redemption only to those whose names are already written in the Book of Life, uses the Word to accomplish His purposes, or accomplishes them without it, as seemeth good to Him. When the Word is used, it is literally His CHANNEL of grace to the souls predestined to salvation

4. The doctrine which we hold combines all that is good in them, and rejects the evil. It gives a high, indeed the highest, place to the Scripture as the instrument of all grace. It pays its tribute to the Spirit Who alone makes it such. But it regards the Spirit's operation as operating not simply and alone THROUGH the Word, but also IN it and WITH it, for salvation

PRAYER

Prayer, or communion with God, is not generally reckoned among the Means of Grace, technically so called. It is regarded rather as the concomitant of the others. But, while it is undeniably true that Prayer is a condition of the efficacy of other means, it is itself and alone a means of grace. In many respects, it is the highest, simplest, most universal, most comprehensive, and most effectual of these means

1. It is the most universal. Wherever the creature is found, Ask and it shall be given you1 is the law that governs its relations to the Creator. The mediation of Christ, which embraces or wraps round the history of all mankind, has established this never-failing medium of communion between the Supreme and every human being. The constitution of nature is framed with reference to this law, and all the acts of Providence suppose it. No philosophical speculations can avail to disturb the original ordinance, though none can avail to explain it. In the whole compass of the Word of God the question never rises as to the difficulty of adjusting the fixed economy of things to this everlasting interference with it: in fact, this everlasting interference is part of the fixed economy. However much the question may be argued, here is the very last word on the subject. The Personal God is the Hearer and Answerer of prayer: as His existence is always postulated and never proved, so His regulation of all things on earth according to the Pre-established Harmony of petition and supply is taken for granted throughout. Prayer is the eternal medium of grace, as grace is distinguished from gifts that are bestowed independently of the creature's will: though, strictly speaking, much of that grace is independent also

1 Matthew 7:7

2. It is all-pervading. The Word by which man lives is made the channel of blessing when its promises are pleaded in prayer. Sacraments derive from this their efficacy. And it is adapted to all conditions of life; private, social, and common prayer open and keep open their several channels into the individual soul, the family, and the congregation. But, while prayer pervades all other means, it extends beyond them all. There is no moment of life, there is no occupation, nor can the petitioning spirit be found in any place, where the turning of the soul to God may not be attended by the full virtue of this everlasting ordinance

3. Hence we see the importance of uniting the Word and Prayer most closely as the abiding, pre-eminent, and essential means of grace. They do not disparage the other means; but must not by them be superseded. This will, however, appear more fully in the consideration of what follows THE SACRAMENTSAS THE ECONOMICAL OR COVENANT MEANS OF GRACE The Savior, who came not to destroy but to fulfill the law, has retained under new forms those two of the ancient ritual observances which were the specific badges of the old covenant as such: Circumcision, the rite by which the covenant was entered, has become Baptism; and the Passover, the rite by which it was annually confirmed, has become the Lord's Supper. These have been instituted for the perpetual observance of the Christian Church, and placed among its means of grace. As means of grace they have elements of difference, and elements in common with the other means. Their difference is that they are Federal Transactions: signs and seals of the covenant of redemption. As signs, they represent in action and by symbols the great blessings of the covenant; as seals they are standing pledges of the Divine fidelity in bestowing them on certain conditions, being the Spirit's instrument in aiding and strengthening the faith which they require, and in assuring to that faith the present bestowment of its object. Thus they are, on the one hand, objective institutions which assure the continuance of the Spirit's administration of redemption in the Church, and, on the other, subjective confirmations to each believing recipient of his own present interest in the covenant. Moreover, as the covenant is NOT OF ONE, but implies the condescension of God in entering into covenant relations with His people, the signs and seals are mutual: they are emblematic ordinances by which the Divine fidelity is pledged, and they are on our part the outward and visible token by which our faith gives its pledges to God of a cordial acceptance of His terms: both, however, by the Holy Ghost. These federal transactions as belonging to the means of grace have also their elements in common with other means. They are based upon the mediation of Him who is the supreme Means of Grace; they are appointed by the same authority; like other means, they are external notes and badges of Christian profession; and, finally, they depend for their efficacy on the Holy Spirit's power working in and through human faith. These ordinances have been from the beginning termed SACRAMENTS. Their nature, and efficacy, and number, and general relation to the means of grace are questions which have been much controverted, and given rise to some of the most important differences among the Christian Confessions What more this topic requires will be best given in a brief view of the history of the sacramental principle in general

1. In the New Testament no designation is given to these symbols. All types, or prophecies in act, ended with Christ the universal Antitype, and all symbols, or visible prophetic representations of invisible realities, ended with the Tongues of fire on the Day of Pentecost, and therefore with the Holy Ghost, the universal spiritual reality. So for as they are prophetic types and symbols they must cease with their fulfillment. This gives deep emphasis to the fact that two symbols were retained, or rather instituted anew, for permanent observance. They are closely connected with the blessings they signify: they are also distinctly separated from them; and by plain command, which we see always obeyed throughout the New Testament, they are made perpetual. This will appear more fully in the discussion of the several Sacraments themselves

2. Very early two names were given to the sacramental institution. In the Greek Church the term Musteerion1 was used: mystery, not in the more general Pauline meaning of a secret disclosed, but in that of the profound significance of some perceptible emblem: hence it is preserved as a

remembrancer of the past in the English Communion Service, " these holy mysteries." By the Western Church the corresponding word SACRAMENTUM was employed: in Roman usage the term had a wide variety of meanings, all however based on the idea of a sacred obligation. It was the oath, particularly that by which the soldier was bound to fidelity: obtemperaturus sum et facturus quicquid mandabitur ab imperatoribus juxta vires. The two ordinances were in the early Church regarded as the rites of religion through which Christians came under the most solemn obligation to do their part in complying with the conditions of grace. Baptism, however, had more of the sacramental character, the Eucharist more that of mystery. In ecclesiastical Latin the word sacramentum came to signify anything consecrated; in the Vulgate it was adopted, as the translation of musteerion; and, as the sign of a sacred thing, became the conventional name of the institute. Later diversities may be referred to the several topics of the Sign, and the Seal, and the Divine appointment 1 Revelation 1:20

SIGNS As to their significatory character there has been no real difference from the beginning among those who have held fast the Sacraments as belonging to the permanent economy of the Gospel. Augustine’s " aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur " or " verba visibilia," Visible Words; and Chrysostom’s etera orooen etera pisteuooen, " one thing we see, another we believe," have been accepted by all Christians alike as rightly indicating the meaning of the emblems, whether of the old covenant or of the new. Here there is no discussion. It has pleased God in every age to include among His divers manners1 the method of teaching by symbol. The Savior Himself so taught: witness His records in the Gospels, from the scourge of cords down to the Feetwashing. Nor is there a word spoken in the New Testament that formally abolishes symbols generally, though the institution of the two sacraments may be fairly considered as implying that they were to stand alone in the worship of the Christian congregation

1 Hebrews 1:1

SEALS Their character as seals has been the subject of much discussion and of wide discrepancy The various theories which have predominated may be studied to great advantage in their historical order

1. In the Early Church we find the germs of every later teaching. But to one who studies attentively there can be no question that a strong tendency betrayed itself almost as soon as the Apostles departed to dwell more on the Mysterium than on the Sacramentum, and to make the whole of religion depend as it were on these two sacramental rites

2. This exaggerated estimate of the ceremonial ordinances took its final form in the Tridentine teaching, which makes the sacraments, not seals of a covenant, but depositories of grace flowing through them of necessity and through them alone: their intrinsic efficacy being supposed always to accompany the priestly administration; if performed, that is, with intention according to the mind of the Church, and on recipients who do not interpose the obstacle of mortal sin. The Council of Trent has this canon: Si quis dixerit per ipsa novae legis sacramenta ex opere operato non conferri gratiam sed solam fidem divinse promissionis ad gratiam consequendam sufficere, anathema sit. This dictum is capable of two constructions. As in the case of Justification it may be said that the faith ALONE is all that is condemned; but the common instinct of Protestantism has seen in it the foundation of the error of a necessary impartation of grace lodged only in the sacraments. This very ancient and wide-spread error, though not held by the Greek Church, has three

characteristics. It elevates unduly the means, which are supposed to contain and as it were mechanically or magically discharge their grace. It makes too much depend upon the mind and purpose of the administrant. And its negative condition, the not interposing an obstacle, or the OBICEM of mortal sin, tends to the dishonor of Evangelical faith, and complicates the subject by involving with it the definitions of mortal and venial sin. The direct influence of the Holy Spirit is also omitted

3. The Lutheran and Reformed types of doctrine concerning the sacramental idea condemn the EX OPERE OPERATO, or that which makes the sacramental act efficacious per se or without reference to the faith of the recipient; but they in some other respects differ

Lutheranism lodges the virtue in the sacraments, makes it inherent in them by the ordination of Christ, but saving only to the believer: it approaches the Romanist theory as to their being the appointed and generally the only channels of salvation. Adopting a maxim of Augustine, Accedit verbum et fit sacramentum, —the Divine word added makes it a sacrament—it regards that consecrating word as conveying into the elements a grace which they must needs impart, to the evil for condemnation and to believers for their good. It makes the sacraments necessary means of grace: not merely the first, and generally necessary; but, as to the specific grace they represent, the only means. A participation in these institutes is held essential to a participation in the things they signify. Hence the sacraments are made in a certain sense the centre of the plan of salvation. This must be remembered in every estimate of Lutheranism as such

4. The Reformed doctrine lays more stress on the concurrence of the Holy Ghost: virtus Spiritus sancti extrinsecus accedens. Not the Word, as in Augustine’s dictum, but the Spirit, makes the sacrament a channel of grace; and, as that Spirit is not bound to forms, He can dispense His grace without the sacraments, before them or after them. Still, though not absolutely necessary, sine qua non, they are preceptively necessary: and, as the appointed seals and pledges of the administration of redeeming grace, they must be observed. The early Socinians went beyond the Swiss Zwingli in making sacraments only signs of Christian profession, and emblems intended to exert a moral influence on the mind: a view which is extensively prevalent among the lesser sections of Christendom both on the Continent and in England

5. The early Arminian doctrine is sometimes classed with the system to which these lastnamed views belong. But let us hear the words of the Remonstrant Confession: Sacramenta cum dicimus, externas Ecclesiae caeremonias seu ritus illos sacros ac solennes intelligimus, quibus veluti foederalibus signis ac sigillis visibilibus Deus gratiosa beneficia sua in foedere praesertim evangelico promissa non modo nobis repraesentat et adumbrat, sed et certo modo exhibet atque obsignat, nosque vicissim palam publiceque declaramus ac testamur, nos promissiones omnes divinas vera, firma atque obsequiosa fide amplecti et beneficia ipsius jugi et grata semper memoria celebrare velle. These words should be carefully studied in their connection, and translated; as presenting, beyond those of any other Symbol, all the elements necessary to make up the true sacramental idea. The definition lays stress on their being Federal signs and seals: not only adumbrating the evangelical blessings of the Christian covenant, but exhibiting and applying them; while they express also our public faith, and grateful remembrance This testimony includes all that is included in our great British Confessions; and, if it adds anything, the addition is an improvement. The Westminster Confession says: " Sacraments are holy signs and seals of the

covenant of grace. There is in every sacrament a spiritual relation, or sacramental union between the sign and the thing signified; whence it comes to pass that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other." And in the Shorter Catechism the Presbyterian standard thus speaks: " A sacrament is a holy ordinance instituted by Christ; wherein, by sensible signs, Christ and the benefits of the New Covenant are represented, sealed, and applied to believers." Here the last expression gives additional strength to the idea of the seal: not only are blessings pledged, but they are then and there imparted. So the Article of the Church of England: " Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace, and God's goodwill towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him." With these symbols —Arminian, Reformed, Anglican—our general Proposition agrees DIVIDE INSTITUTION As to the Divine institution of the sacraments there have been two leading errors. One, represented by some of the more pantheistic Mystics in earlier ages, and by the Quakers in modern times, denies the permanent obligation of these ordinances. According to the latter Baptism was intended only for the first introduction of Gentiles into the new community; the Eucharist was only the sanctification of the common nourishment of life; and, generally, the Christian economy has and can have in it no ritual. The other error has gone to the opposite extreme, and multiplied the sacramental institutions of Christianity ADDITIONS TO THE SACRAMENTS

1. The origin of this multiplication of sacraments may be traced to the indefinite use of the term in early phraseology: it was applied to almost every mystery of the Christian Faith and almost every religious symbol. Thus Augustine, while allowing their supremacy to the Two, speaks in an uncertain and wavering manner concerning some other rites of a sacramental nature. Bernard was disposed to add the Feet-washing, and many writers before and after him mention other symbolical acts of Christ among the sacraments. The Seven Sacraments were first defined by Otto of Bamberg, A.D. 1124; these received ecclesiastical sanction at Florence, A.D. 1439, and were confirmed at the Council of Trent. They were variously illustrated and defended by the Scholastics. It was supposed that each was symbolized by or symbolized one of the seven cardinal virtues, Faith, Love, Hope, Wisdom, Temperance, Courage, Righteous-ness; they were explained by the analogy of the spiritual life with the physical, as to Birth, Growth into adult age, Nourishment, Healing, Reproduction, Instruction, Death; and so forth. The final definition at Trent admits the pre-eminence of the Eucharist: Sanctitate longe caeteris antecellit. Baptism, Confirmation, Orders were held to have an indelible character, never effaceable, and never to be repeated. The anathema is pronounced upon those who deny that the Seven were all, if not equally, instituted by Christ: admitting therefore that the appointment of our Lord is the only and final test of a true sacrament

2. It is remarkable that the Greek and the Roman communions, differing in so much besides, agree in accepting seven sacraments. Both base their acceptance on the authority of the Church as interpreting the will of Christ, and vindicate them as enfolding and hedging round and sanctifying the whole of life at its several stages: Baptism is the sanctification of birth, Confirmation of adult life, Penance of the life of daily sin, the Eucharist of life itself, Orders of legitimate authority, Matrimony of the Church's law of continuance and increase, and Unction of the departure hence. Other communions have attempted, and are attempting, to introduce the

distinction between sacramental ordinances which are not sacraments and sacraments proper, but the test of our Lord's own institution absolutely forbids any addition to His two covenant institutes. "A sacrament is an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, ordained by Christ Himself as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof." Our Lord has chosen and hallowed two, only two; and it is vain to elevate acts which are rather benedictory or only symbolical than sacramental into sacraments proper

3. The Apology for the Augsburg Confession allowed Penance to be one of the Saviour's sacramental institutes, and Melanchthon was disposed to admit into the number Ordination. These were not retained, however, in the churches of the Reformation, although the Lutherans preserved Confession as a wholesome part of the rejected Orders The definition in the English Article strikes the true note: the Five added by Rome " are not to be counted sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God." To this, however, may be added that they have no connection with the covenant character of the Gospel of Christ Having this test to apply, we may consider the additional sacraments in their order THE FIVE ADDED SACRAMENTS

1. The supposed sacrament of CONFIRMATION sprang out of a rite anciently known as CHRISM or THE SEAL, which was thought to add the positive gift of the Spirit to the baptismal removal of guilt: thus early binding up with its error important truth. It was administered not before the seventh year, and only by a bishop, as succeeding to the Apostolical prerogative of imposition of hands. In its final development in the Middle Ages the imposition and anointing constitute the Matter of the sacrament; and the Form: Signo te signo crucis et confirmo te chrismate salutis in nomine, etc. The Scriptural ground for this fails before strict examination. Our Lord's baptism with the Holy Ghost has of course no relation to the question. Nor are the instances in which Apostles imparted the Holy Ghost to the Samaritans: this was a special recognition of Samaritan Christianity by peculiar and almost Pentecostal tokens.1 The baptism and anointing of John's disciples at Ephesus were simultaneous: these had not before received Christian baptism.2 Another passage commonly adduced is that in which St. Paul says that after they believed the Ephesians were sealed: here the Greek requires, when ye believed ye were sealed.3 The reception of the young by formal profession of faith into the congregation has been a laudable usage in some communions. But there is no sacramental institute for that purpose 1 Acts 8:1-40; 2 Acts 19:4; 3 Ephesians 1:13

2. The system of PENANCE elaborated in the early Church was based upon the presumed necessity of making satisfaction to God for sin committed after baptism. As finally elevated into a sacrament, its Matter—to use the scholastic phrase—is Contritio cordis, Confessio oris, Satisfactio operis. The Form is the judicial act and word of absolution The Contrition of heart is not required to be absolutely perfect. Attrition, or a sincere desire to repent, may be enough; the Confession is auricular, including omnia et singula peccata mortalia, and at least once in the year. The satisfaction supposes that the priest is a judge who, in the name of God, imposes penances as the condition of the remission of temporal punishments of the sin, which, as to the reatus culpae and its eternal consequences, is forgiven for Christ's merits' sake. These temporal penalties may be exacted in this life or in the intermediate state: both being temporal. They may be commuted for

satisfactions of various kinds, fasting, prayer, alms; which, however, were connected often with the most unevangelical forms of self-discipline. On this sacrament of Penance hangs the doctrine of Purgatory, the scene where the supreme satisfaction of Christ is supplemented: as also Indulgences, based on the fund of merit stored in the Church, and granted, avowedly for the remission of temporal penalty, often, in popular acceptation, for the remission of all sin whatever. This most important institute is not based upon the Word of God: the Scriptural Absolution is the declaration of the terms of forgiveness, its Confession is not auricular and enforced, its only Satisfaction is the perfect obedience of Christ, and its only Judge and Confessor the Lord Himself

3. The sacrament of ORDERS or consecration to the priesthood is closely connected with the last: quo tribuitur potestas consecrandi corpus et sanguinem Domini, nec non remittendi et retinendi peccata. As the baptized were endued with grace by imposition of episcopal hands, so episcopal hands alone could confer the specific grace of the priesthood. But there is nothing either in our Lord's appointment of His ministers or in the Apostolical confirmation of it, that sustains such an investiture with such tremendous privileges and responsibilities. Of this more will be said in the appropriate place

4. MATRIMONY was elevated to the dignity of a sacrament mainly on the ground of the Apostle's words: This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church.1 As a sacrament the ordinance of marriage is treated most elaborately in the Roman and in the Eastern Theology. It has really, however, the slenderest title of all the usurpers of the sacramental character; being only a natural relation sanctified, and honored as signifying the Saviour's union with His Church. In strange contradiction to this high character of the ordinance was its undervaluation in the celibate life, whether in or out of the priesthood 1 Ephesians 5:32

5. EXTREME UNCTION rests mainly on the anointing in St. James 1:1-27 where, however, the rite had no reference to death. Its sacramental institution by Christ is supposed to be found in an allusion to a similar subject in St. Mark's Gospel,2 concerning which the same remark may be made. It is a comprehensive sacrament, the Viaticum, useful for the soul and, if God will, for the body too: effectus est mentis sanatio et, in quantum autem expedit, ipsius etiam corporis (Cone. Flor. 1439) 1 James 5:14-15; 2 Mark 6:13 UNDERVALUATION OF SACRAMENTS The opposite error, that of those who deny the authoritative; institution of sacramental means of grace, in the sense in which we understand the term, that is, ordinances which pledge or seal, as well as symbolize, to those who worthily receive them the grace of redemption, should be carefully avoided

1. There are those, as we have seen, who would honor the spiritual character of the religion of Christ by dispensing with His own express appointments. But they are surely on the way to the same error who regard our Lord as having placed in His Church two rites which are only rites, only symbols teaching the eye whether of the assistants or the spectators, and thus make Him the Founder of a purely ritual and symbolical service. Had that been His design, we should have accepted it with reverence. But it was not His design. There is nothing ordained by Him for the permanent observance of His people which is not accompanied by the Holy Ghost, and made the channel of its own appropriate grace. The rites of Christianity have their concomitant benedictions; and are never without them, save to such as bring no preparation of faith, the absence of which makes all religion a mere ceremonial. The true doctrine is between two extremes. It avoids the

delusive over-statement that connects specific blessings, regeneration, and the sustenance of Christ's life, with the sacraments as their sole conductors to the soul: these are only the covenant pledges of a gift that is with and through them imparted, but not necessarily with and through them alone. And it avoids the delusive under-statement that makes sacramental ordinances mere signs that aesthetically act on the minds of those who wait upon them. This, it may be repeated, is to abolish the distinction between those symbolical actions of our Lord—such as His setting a child in the midst, blighting the figtree, washing His disciples' feet, breathing forth the Holy Ghost—which were actions that taught their lesson by symbol first and were afterwards interpreted by His words, and those permanent ceremonies which He ordained to be Means as well as signs of His grace to the believer

2. There is, however, an undervaluation of the sacraments which springs from no theological opposition or scruple, but is the result of indifference or ignorance. There are many unbaptised children whose parents are responsible for the neglect of the Saviour's command, a neglect which will not be visited on the children themselves. But the neglect is, perhaps, more striking in the case of the other sacrament It is not that it is treated with irreverence; but, for want of adequate instruction, multitudes come to regard the Lord's Supper as a religious solemnity in some way or other connected with the acceptance of religious responsibilities, and dependent for its blessing upon the vigor of faith and expectation in the communicant, but without any distinct perception of its peculiar and distinct place in the Evangelical economy. The recoil from one extreme has carried these too far in the opposite direction. It ought to be matter of solicitude on the part of Christian ministers to teach their people the right doctrine of the sacraments: especially that which lays emphasis upon their relation to the new covenant, its benefits and obligations. They are "signs and seals of the covenant of grace established in Christ: which is a covenant with promise on the part of God, and with Conditions on the part of man." Nor should they be suffered to forget the meaning of the Sacramental institute: " an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof." BAPTISM

Baptism is an ordinance appointed by our Lord to be the rite of initiation into the new covenant of grace and fellowship of its kingdom; being the sign and seal of the blessings of that covenant conferred upon those who thereby avow their acceptance of the one condition of faith in Jesus Christ with its obligations. It is the sacrament of union with Christ, of pardon and renewal through His Gospel, and of membership in His Church: being the outward and visible sign of the sealing of the Holy Ghost, Who is the interior Bond of communion between the believer and the Lord, the Agent in imparting that forgiveness and regeneration of which the washing of water is the sign, and the Sanctifier of the people of God. The nature, mode of administration and subjects of this rite are clearly set forth in the New Testament; but have been variously interpreted in ecclesiastical doctrine and practice. It will be expedient, therefore, to examine the authoritative Scripture first, and afterwards briefly to view the subject in the light of controversy THE DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE OF BAPTISM IN SCRIPTURE The Word of God furnishes a preliminary history of this rite as linked with the Old Covenant, through usages which are changed in the New; it gives a clear account of its institution and observance; and defines its meaning and relation to the economy of grace These topics correspond to the teaching of the Old Testament, of the Gospels and Acts, and of the Epistles respectively

I. Many rites, ceremonies, types, symbols, and predictions pointed forward to baptism and found in this simple ordinance their fulfillment. Its special Old-Testament representative was the covenant rite of circumcision: the type of baptism as it was the rite of admission into the old covenant of grace, established first with Abraham for all nations in his Seed the Christ, and renewed through Moses with the same People now more distinguished from the rest of mankind. As given to Abraham it was the seal of the righteousness of the faith which lie had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised.1 It was as it were the baptism of the father of the faithful, and in its very origin predicted its own future abolition. As limited in Moses, it was the symbol of the sanctification of physical life and natural increase, and the seal of participation in external and limited privileges. In both respects it was ordained only till the Seed should come to Whom the Promise was made.2 Baptism took its place as the sign of the sanctification of the whole of life both of man and woman, of a spiritual birth and increase; as the seal also of internal, universal, and unending privileges. Of another order were the two great historical types, the Deluge, and salvation by its waters, and the passage of the Red Sea. Each of these is alluded to in a very significant way. St. Paul says that the circumcised people were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea:3 a solitary instance of the term baptism being carried back to the Old Testament. St. Peter gives an equally unique instance of the use of the word Antitype: speaking of the Deluge he says, the like figure (antitupon) whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us.4 Passing by the ritual types, such as the ceremonial washings of the old law, we find a wider field in the Prophets who predicted the effusion of the Holy Ghost,5 of which Christian baptism was to be the symbol, under the similitude of cleansing waters:6 poured out, for ever flowing, and sprinkled upon the soul The ancient baptism of proselytes from heathenism —ancient as to us, modern as to the Hebrews—probably had no foundation in the Old Testament beyond the general practice of washing before sacrificing to God. But it seems indisputable, from Rabbinical authorities, that after the captivity every proselyte was circumcised and baptized; moreover, that this baptism included the women and children of his house. This accounts for the general familiarity with the rite assumed in the Gospels. It sheds light upon the institute of John the Baptist and our Lord’s baptism of His disciples. It must be borne in mind in our interpretation of St. Peter’s words on the Day of Pentecost: there can be no doubt how his hearers would understand, The promise is unto you, and to your children.7 1Romans 4:11; 2Galatians 3:19; 31 Corinthians 10:2; 41 Peter 3:21; 5Zechariah 13:1; 6Ezekiel 36:25; 7Acts 2:39

II. The institution of Christian Baptism has its gradual history. We have the Gospel preliminary baptisms; the Saviour’s express and formal New-Testament appointment: and the occasional observance of the rite as described in the first records of the early New- Testament Church 1. The Baptism of John has a distinct significance and stands alone: to Ioannou Baptisma

It was the baptism of repentance as the preparation for Christ and the New Covenant;1 even as it was the rite of transition from the Old Testament to the New. As it belonged to the Old, Jesus Himself, made under the law,2 submitted to it; as it belonged to the New, He received it not: His New-Testament baptism was the effusion of the Holy Spirit upon His human nature, restoring to MAN in Him the Spirit forfeited by the Fall. Our Lord’s preliminary act of baptizing, as administered by His disciples, was partly a continuation of the Baptist’s, even as He preached over again John’s repentance; partly an accommodation to the later Jewish usage of baptizing proselytes; and partly a preparation for His own final ordinance. Neither of His two sacraments was absolutely new: both

were rather the sanctification of a certain remainder of past observances which linked then with the old economy 1 Acts 19:3; 2 Galatians 4:4

2. The Christian institute itself was enacted in one clear and definite injunction. It had been prepared for in act, as we have seen; doubtless also in word during the Forty Days: hence the formula was understood when finally used: into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.1 The baptized were to be dedicated by man, and consecrated by the Spirit, to the possession and service and redeeming grace of the Mediatorial Trinity. Both sacraments were appointed by Christ, to be fully interpreted by the Holy Ghost The Supper preceded the death of which it was the commemoration; Baptism preceded the Pentecost which was its fulfillment. That day declared its meaning: the One Triune Name, and the various blessings of the Persons in that name; its substitution in place of circumcision as appointed for all nations; its covenant character, as sealing the benefits of the Christian charter of privileges to all who on their part believe and observe the commandments

1 Matthew 28:19 3. From the day of Pentecost onward the rite is observed as an indispensable ordinance

There is no instance of conversion with which it is not connected: they were baptized, both men and women.1 But the full formula does not occur: baptism was in the name of Christ or of the Lord2 (epi and en as well as eis), representing the Trinity. Once, in the case of Samaria, the sacrament was supplemented by the imposition of Apostolic hands and the gift of the Holy Ghost; once, in the case of Cornelius, it followed that gift; once it was a fruitless ceremony, in the case of Simon Magus. Always it was administered by the officers of the church: those who preached thus admitted their converts into the community

St. Paul was a high exception, but he gives the reason of his satisfaction at having baptized so few in Corinth: partly, his jealousy for the name of Christ, partly his higher obligation to preach the Gospel. The households of believing persons were thus consecrated: including obviously their children, whose baptism is not mentioned because implied in the Lord’s benediction of them. That they received it, however, needs no other proof than that baptism superseded circumcision, and that children are already addressed as members of the Christian Church 1 Acts 8:12; 2 Acts 2:38 III. The later Apostolic teaching on this subject remains to be considered: it will be found abundantly full and clear

1. The new ordinance is everywhere regarded as having superseded circumcision as a sign and seal of the Christian covenant. Nothing can be plainer than that the old rite was done away with. If admitted in any case, it was for reasons of expediency; if not practiced as the rite of an imperfect covenant, but only as a national usage slowly given up, it was a thing indifferent. But circumcision, as the initiatory rite of the preparatory dispensation, was lost in baptism. Negatively and positively St. Paul says: Ye are complete in Him, which is the Head of all principality and power . . . in Whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: buried with Him in baptism.1 Let us note the points here

There is no longer any circumcision save that which is WITHOUT HANDS; but this rite, which, like the Passover, had its last observance in our Lord, revives in another ceremony: baptism is the

circumcision of Jesus, and teaches the old lesson in another way. The same death of the sinful flesh which the ancient rite signified is signified also by the new one. But it was done away by being transfigured, and baptism is the sign and seal of the better covenant: bound up with it essentially 1 Colossians 2:10-12 2. We may view this more generally and more particularly

(1.) All the blessings of the Christian covenant are represented as summed up in the Promise made to Abraham; that Promise was Christ, the Seed, and the blessing of Abraham, the Holy Spirit As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ:1 here is the relation of baptism to the reception of Christ and union with Him. Be baptized, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost:2 here is its relation to the bestowment of the Spirit. These connect it with the two branches of the covenant Promise 1 Galatians 3:27; 2 Acts 2:38

(2.) But this is general: we may find many references to the specific blessings which are exhibited and pledged to the believer in his baptism. Foremost is justification or the forgiveness of sins: St. Peter cries, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins;1 and Ananias to Paul, Be baptized, and wash away thy sins.2 Christian Sonship, both as adoption and as regeneration, is sealed in baptism: Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.3 Naturally, however, the relation of baptism to circumcision would suggest its more frequent connection with regeneration than with adoption. After having spoken of the symbolical design of circumcision, the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, the Apostle goes on: Buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him through a faith in the working of God, Who hath raised Him from the dead.4 This passage makes baptism represent the dying to sin and rising to holiness: one part of the ceremony, the immersion, signifying the conformity to our Lord’s death; the other, the rising out of the water, conformity with His resurrection. With this may be connected the parallel to the Romans. It was our Lord Who first connected baptism with the new birth, Except a, man be born of water and of the Spirit;5 and St. Paul winds up the long strain of Christian teaching in his words to Titus concerning the laver of regeneration.6 Less directly baptism is sometimes connected with sanctification. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body:7 where the Church is referred to as the Lord’s sanctified body, of which it is said, that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word.8 St. Peter calls the Christian baptism the antitype of the typical salvation of the ark wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water; which, in its antitype, baptism, now saveth you also (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the inquiry of a good conscience after God);9 where justification and sanctification unite, though neither of the terms is used. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, as in St. Peter’s First, we cannot but feel that the inward sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ corresponds with the outward sprinkling of water, its sign. So also in St. John’s mysterious words, This is He Who came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ, not by water only, but by water and blood.10 Even if the primary allusion is to the Lord’s ministerial work as begun at the Jordan, and ended on the cross, there is also a reference to the external washing of baptism and internal washing of the Atonement of which that is the sign: pardon and the new life

1 Acts 2:38; 2 Acts 22:16; 3 Galatians 3:26-27; 4 Colossians 2:12; 5 John 3:5; 6 Titus 3:5; 7 1 Corinthians 12:13; 8 Ephesians 5:26; 9 1 Peter 3:21; 10 1 John 5:6

3. Now, in all these passages the sacrament of baptism is, as it were, identified with the blessings which it signifies; and in such a way as will not allow us to think for a moment of its being a mere ritual sign. St. Paul speaks of one Lord, one faith, one baptism:1 this gives the last of the three a very prominent place; as it not only makes it the badge of Christian profession, but also seems to embrace in one word all the blessings of Christianity, not otherwise mentioned In fact, the privileges of the covenant are supposed to be sealed, obsignated, imparted to true believers in connection with their baptism. This ordinance is never made the sole instrument on the part of God, nor ever the sole condition on the part of man; but it is invariably the seal of the transaction between God and the believer as in the presence of the Church. Blessings may be bestowed before the sealing transaction; and still larger blessings follow it; but in any case they are all, according to the rule certainly, sealed over and pledged to the baptized believer as one of the congregation. However looked at— whether as affusion, sprinkling, immersion, —it is a SIGN of the descent of the Spirit, and the washing away of sin. And it is a SEAL once for till given of the bestowment of the blessings of the Spirit upon the believer continuing to believe. But it must ever be remembered that, in every reference to this symbolical ordinance, we find it flanked on the one hand by the absolute necessity of faith as a condition, and on the other by the sole efficiency of the Spirit as the Agent of all good

1 Ephesians 4:5

4. It must not be forgotten that the initiatory sacrament has in the Epistles a universal character, as extending and enlarging the meaning of the former rite, and adapting it to a more catholic economy. The cardinal passage has been already quoted in part: For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are oil one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.1 Circumcision here vanishes in the very nature of the case, as we need not further explain. Our Lord’s sign must be on every one that is His; and baptism for all, for men and women, for adults and children, takes its place. Water everywhere flows for all the world: See, here is water.2 By this the God of the Christian covenant should sprinkle many nations:3 in a figurative view of the passage. Nothing that circumcision either signed or sealed under the old economy can be lost under the new: therefore children have their privileges in the Christian covenant sealed to them in their baptism. Accordingly, they are addressed as members of the church in every Epistle. If it be asked, What is the blessing sealed to them? the answer is, all that they are capable of receiving. As children of a race under condemnation they are justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.4 Children of wrath as belonging to the lineage of the first Adam, they are grafted into the Second: their baptism is the seal of their present adoption, and the pledge of their regeneration when they are capable of it

Unholy by nature, they are sanctified through baptismal consecration to God: Christ has blessed them, their alien estate is past, and noic are your children holy.5 In the case of adults personal faith, and conscious acceptance of the terms of the covenant, are essential Of this infants are incapable; but the Lord is their everlasting Sponsor; and when He said, of suth is the kingdom of heaven,6 He admitted them to all the privileges of His covenant, including the gift of the Spirit, to take from them the doom of the race, and to afford them all the preliminary influences of His salvation. The baptism of the children of believing parents is, therefore, a sign of the washing away

of original guilt, and a seal of their adoption into the family of God; a sign of the regeneration which their nature needs, and a seal of its impartation in God's good time 1 Galatians 3:27-29; 2 Acts 8:36; 3 Isaiah 52:15; 4 Romans 3:24; 5 1 Corinthians 7:14; 6 Matthew 19:14 BAPTISM IN HISTORICAL THEOLOGY The development of doctrine concerning this ordinance or sacrament needs to be exhibited only in broad and general outline

I. The primitive Church attached to it a very high importance as the SACRAMENT OF THE NEW LIFE. It was in the East usually termed the photismos or Illumination; and hyperbolical language abounds in the description of its virtues and privileges. The ritual of the ordinance soon began to reflect this teaching

1. Very early it was regarded as the instrument of the conveyance rather than as the sign and seal of Christian blessings; but the forgiveness it conveyed was only of past sins

Hence arose by degrees the necessity of a new Sacrament of Penance. The absolute necessity of baptism was expressed in unqualified terms; though in the case of its accidental absence only contempt was ground of condemnation. Martyrdom with its baptism of blood was supposed to supersede it or condone its absence. The Eastern Church has always preferred dipping, the Western sprinkling

2. The Catechumenate as an institution sprang out of this sacrament by an internal necessity, at first preceding adult baptism and afterwards following that of infants. With its Catechists, Catechumens, and Catechisms, it has always in some form existed in Christendom: though its early character has never been fully maintained in later years, much to the loss of, the Christian cause. In the third century the catechumens were divided, with reference to their final initiation into the mystery of the Supper, into Audientes or outside hearers of doctrine, Genuflectentes or those who prayed with the Church, and Competentes or candidates for full and determinate admission to all the privileges of Christianity

3. The ceremonial of baptism soon became elaborate: so elaborate as to form, equally with the ceremonial of the Eucharist, a perfect contrast to the simplicity of our Lord's institution. In the fourth century the water was consecrated; and Epiphany, Easter, Pentecost were the seasons of the year preferred for its celebration. Tertullian mentions the Sponsors, the Confession, and the Creed. Three immersions were usual in some parts, and a triple sprinkling, both with reference to the Trinity. Exorcism and the renunciation of Satan occupied in the rite an important place, which both in East and West they have retained. The particulars of the ritualistic development must be elsewhere studied

4. INFANT BAPTISM gradually, and of necessity, rose into ascendancy. The objection of Tertullian establishes the fact of the practice: he urged against precipitancy in performing the ceremony that its blessing once forfeited never could be retrieved or fully restored. As early as Cyprian (Cone. Carth. 253) early baptism was decreed: the third day, though the eighth was admissible. From that time it was an uncontested usage of Christendom, and that on the ground of its being an Apostolical usage. On this latter point Origen is express, and he is but one of a large consensus of authors. For instance, in the Pelagian controversy it was used as an argument in defense of Original Sin

5. In the third century heretical baptism was matter of earnest controversy. Cyprian denied its validity, on ecclesiastical principles, but the authority of the Church at Rome prevailed: resting its plea on the ground of the objective value of the rite, by whomsoever performed in the name of the Holy Trinity, II. The Romanist doctrine confirmed at Trent the doctrinal decisions and the symbolical ritual which had long been current in the mediaeval Church. It ordained that Baptism must be supplemented by Confirmation. It decreed that in Baptism " that is taken away which has the character of sin: it is not merely cut down or not imputed." Concupiscence not in itself sinful, either in Adam or in us, remains as the fomes or fuel of possible sin, and for the matter of our virtue and reward through its constant suppression. In fact all the benefits of redemption are applied to the soul. Nothing, however, so clearly exhibits the doctrine as the variety of ritual: from the blessing of the water, through exorcism, the chrism, the white garment, to the giving of the name

III. Lutheranism, in harmony with its high theory of the sacraments, makes baptism ordinarily necessary to salvation, conveying by Divine appointment the blessings of remission of sins and regeneration. Without faith, however, the adult receives no benefit; and the Spirit works in infants the receptivity of faith, about which, it need not be added, there have been endless discussions. Repentance after baptism is, as it were, a " regressus ad baptismum," a return to the baptismal position. The Reformed Churches generally make the internal effect, concur with the external act in the case of the believing elect

Infants are presumed to be elect, and the benefit in their case is only seminal and prospective. The Anglican Formularies are, taken as a whole, a combination of the Lutheran and the Reformed. They distinctly teach regeneration to be the secret virtue of baptism, in adults believing and in all infants. But there are two views of the doctrine which have always had their supporters: first, that which is more Lutheran and sacramentarian and supposes a renewal of the soul of the infant or a certain infusion of a new life; and, secondly, that which regards the new birth as in infants a change of relation only, by which they are translated into the kingdom of grace: meaning adoption rather than regeneration

IV. The doctrine of the Baptist Communities differs from that of Christendom at large in two points: they insist that baptism was appointed to be an expression of adult faith in Christ, denying the right and duty of infant baptism; and they maintain that the only valid baptism is that of immersion in water. Agreeing with them in what they hold, the majority of Churches differ from them in what they deny; but not attributing so much importance to the points of difference as they do

1. It is important to establish the validity of infant baptism, inasmuch as by degrees that becomes, in established Christian communities which admit infants to the rite, the only baptism. Moreover, the settlement of this question is bound up with the wider question of what constitutes membership in the external body or fellowship of Christendom

(1.) The Christian Fellowship is the continuation of a community in which children had always been reckoned members. The Church of God in Christ has been one through all ages: the ancients believed in the Seed that should come to Whom the promise was made,1 and were circumcised, they and their children; we believe in the Christ who has come, and are baptized, we and our children. The Gentiles were grafted into the old, the good olive-tree,2 which olive-tree is really the True Vine. The covenant with Abraham was for all the families of the earth3 in due time; and,

meanwhile, the sign and seal of that covenant was impressed on children not as subjects of the Hebrew commonwealth merely, but as members of the Hebrew Church. Not a word in the New Testament indicates any change: the promise of the Spirit is unto you, and, to your children;4 households were baptized and the family still sanctified; and even the very silence of the New Testament forbids that we should take from children a birthright they had enjoyed from the beginning. From this argument there is no appeal 1 Galatians 3:19 2 Romans 11:24; 3 Genesis 12:3; 4 Acts 2:39 (2.) The theory of the Church held by those who reject infant baptism is not a sound one

It is simply this, that none are to be admitted to membership who do not give credible evidence to the congregation of being regenerate. This principle, as adopted by the Congregationalists, allows all such professors to communicate and to bring their children to baptism for their training towards the full privileges of the new covenant. As adopted by the Baptists, it allows of no membership at all until a credible profession of living faith is made and sealed in the sacrament. These views are altogether too narrow for the spirit of the catholic Gospel. It is impossible to limit the Church, or admission to its ordinances, to the regenerate as approved by men. All who profess faith in the doctrines of Christ, who are seeking salvation, whose lives do not contradict their profession or impeach their sincerity, may be accepted to baptism; and their children with them. To such all the ordinances of religion are open; according to their faith they are dealt with, and the Lord knoweth them that are His.1 Their principle refuses to infants, who cannot consciously believe and intelligently profess the faith, a place in the congregation of the regenerate. We deny that the visible Church is limited to the regenerate. Children belong to the Christian fellowship as an institute for making men perfect Christians: they are adopted into the family of God and the household of faith; they are to be trained in the nurture and admonition of the Lord;2 they are members before they finally ratify their vows; and the gentle supposition of Christianity is that the influences of the Spirit upon them will bless their instruction amidst Evangelical ordinances to their full participation in all the privileges of both the visible and invisible fold. Meanwhile, the Lord still says, Of such is the kingdom of God.3 12 Timothy 2:19; 2 Ephesians 6:4; 3 Mark 10:14

2. The mode of baptism might seem to be a less important matter in a religion which is not ritualistic. But the Baptist community thinks otherwise. In dealing with this subject we have only to show that the three kinds of baptism—by immersion, by affusion, and by sprinkling—are equally valid according to the appointment of Christ; but that the weight of the evidence is in favor of the last, or of the two latter, which in this argument may be regarded as one and the same

(1.) The equal admissibility of the two kinds, pouring or sprinkling and immersing, is proved by three considerations. First, the influences of the Spirit, of which baptism is the outward and visible sign, are described throughout Scripture in language which aptly represents both. I will pour out My Spirit;1 and then will I sprinkle clean water upon you.2 These begin the series; it is ended by the washing of regeneration.3 Secondly, the word baptize in the original Greek, whether in its classic or in its Scriptural use, is capable of both significations: then went he down, and dipped himself seven times in Jordan4 (ebaptisato). Except they wash (bap-tisontai) they eat not.5 The defiled person was sprinkled from his uncleanness,6 which in the Apocrypha is baptisomenos apo nekron baptized from a dead body; and in the Revelation bebammenon aimati describes the Saviour's vesture stained in blood,7 according to the prophet, Their blood shall be sprinkled upon My garments.8 In fact, the word in all its forms refers to the contact of water without prescribing the

manner. Thirdly, the practice of the Christian Church from the beginning has allowed both, as we have seen, and this should have its weight

1 Joel 2:28; 2 Ezekiel 36:25; 3 Titus 3:5; 4 2 Kings 5:14; 5 Mark 7:4; 6 Numbers 19:13; 7 Revelation 19:13; 8 Isaiah 63:3

(2.) But there are many considerations which lead us to regard affusion or sprinkling as the ordained form of the rite. The catholic design of the Gospel suggests that the simplest and most universally practicable ordinance would be appointed. Again, the most important realities of which baptism is only the sign are such as sprinkling or affusion indicates: the blood of atonement was sprinkled on the people and on the mercy-seat; and the gifts of the Holy Ghost are generally illustrated by the pouring of water and the anointing. Moreover, the multitudinous baptisms of the New Testament forbid the possibility of immersion: especially when it is remembered that whole families were baptized, and individuals sometimes, where large quantities of water cannot be supposed to have been accessible. As to the passages which describe this sacrament as burial with Christ and resurrection with Him, they must be interpreted by the analogy of those which describe it as dying with Christ and putting Him on. It may be said, further, that there are words which obviously would have been employed instead of baptism if the practice of immersion had been deemed essential. This last argument is of great force when we remember how carefully the institution of the two sacraments has been guarded in the revelation of the New Testament. As it respects the Lord’s Supper, there is no room for misapprehension: every departure from the simplicity of the ordinance is self-convicted

Now, if it had been the Saviour’s will that every convert and every infant throughout all ages should be immersed in the baptismal flood He would have told us so in language that could not be mistaken. But the vast majority of the Christian world has understood by baptism the pouring or sprinkling of water. It may be said that this only shows our Lord’s intention to have been to allow a large latitude of observance. Be it so: of this none can complain. But it may be inferred that, if the more cumbrous and difficult rite was not ordained, the simpler one would everywhere be understood to be more in harmony with His will

V. The doctrine taught by Methodism may be said to hold the mean between two extremes as to the efficacy of this Sacrament, 1. Its authoritative standards repudiate the notion that Baptism is merely a sign or badge of Christian profession; as also that which, going a little farther, is content to make it only an impressive ritualistic emblem of the washing away of sin. The Methodist teaching on the Sacraments, seals as well as signs of the Christian covenant, will not allow that either of the two ordinances is without its accompanying grace to the recipient who complies with the covenant conditions. As to Baptism, Mr. Wesley’s note on Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit1 runs thus: " Except he experience that great inward change by the Spirit, and be baptized (wherever baptism can be had) as the outward sign and means of it." 1 John 3:5

2. Those standards do not teach that Baptism is the sole ordinary appointed means of communicating the virtue of the atonement in the remission of sins and the bestowment of the new life. They reject the dogma of Baptismal Regeneration as tending unevangelically to bind together the sign and the thing signified. This term, common to all high sacramentarian theology, Romanist, Oriental, Lutheran and Anglican, expresses the principle that in the economy of grace Baptism is the sole ordained channel of the renewing Spirit. It certainly is the Divine and authoritative seal;

but not the only or the necessary channel. The impartation of regenerate life may be distinct from the seal: it may accompany it, it may have preceded it, and it may, as in the case of infants, follow it But, however viewed, its importance is great, as an integral part of the new covenant in Christ

3. Mr. Wesley was trained to believe in a possible regeneration of infants. In his sermon on the New Birth he says: "It is certain our Church supposes that all who are baptized in their infancy are at the same time born again." "Nor is it an objection of any weight against this, that we cannot comprehend how this work can be wrought in infants. For neither can we comprehend how it is wrought in a person of riper years.'" For himself he never distinctly defined this: " But whatever be the case with infants, it is sure all of riper years who are baptized are not at the same time born again." His views of the preliminary grace signified by the new birth of infants have been more fully expressed by later expositors of Methodist doctrine. Mr. Watson's summary may be accepted as giving their meaning. "To the infant child it is a visible reception into the same covenant and church, —a pledge of acceptance through Christ, — the bestowment of a title to all the grace of the covenant as circumstances may require, and as the mind of the child may be capable, or made capable, of receiving it." " It secures, too, the gift of the Holy Spirit in those secret spiritual influences by which the actual regeneration of those children who die in infancy is effected; and which are a seed of life in those who are spare! THE EUCHARIST The Lord's Supper is a rite ordained by our Lord for perpetual observance in His Church, as a sacramental feast in which bread and wine are signs of His sacred body and blood offered in one oblation on the cross, and seals of the present and constant impartation to the believer of all the benefits of His passion. In this supper the Church joyfully and thankfully celebrates before the world the sacrifice once presented in the past, until He come again without sin unto salvation. Moreover, the Lord's people partake of the elements as the symbol of a common Christian life and sustentation, as the mutual pledge of union and brotherly fellowship, with all its enjoyments and obligations. Thus this ordinance is the Sacrament, as it signifies and seals the mystical nourishment of Christ; the Eucharist, as commemorating the sacrifice of redemption; and the Communion, as the badge of united Christian profession. While most Christian people agree as to this last, there have been many and great divisions both as it respects the blessings conveyed in the Sacrament, and the nature of the Eucharistical commemoration. We shall find it useful, as in the case of the other Sacrament, to examine the testimony of Scripture, and then consider the controversies of dogma SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE The statements of the New Testament are few, but exceedingly distinct. They describe the institution of a new rite instead of the Passover, and connect it especially with the ratification of the new covenant. St. Paul adds the account that he received by special revelation, and in it, a few additional points of doctrine. Besides these four records of the institution, there are sundry incidental allusions tending to complete our view of the circumstantials of the rite itself. We must glance at the doctrine and the ritual of the second sacrament, which was instituted in connection with the Passover, and to supersede it for ever

1. Now the ancient rite was an annual commemoration of the typical redemption of the Hebrew people; and the Lord's Supper is the solemn act of the Church's commemoration of the redeeming death of the Savior of the world. St. Paul's account, the last and fullest authentic statement of the institution, stamps great prominence on this. He adds In remembrance of Me1 to the giving of the bread, as well as to the giving of the cup; and, with reference to both, he appends, Ye do show the Lord's death till He come.2 Our Savior blessed the elements and gave thanks:3 offering the praise

of His own atonement which His people continue for ever. Hence the rite is the great expression of the Church's gratitude for the gift of Christ, and especially for His atoning death. It is the feast of thanksgiving within the Christian assembly, and it is the feast of testimony before the world, showing4 [forth] His death. And the first word used, eucharisteésas, gives the ordinance a name: it is a thankful and glorying commemoration, or the EUCHARIST 1 1 Corinthians 11:23-26; 2 Matthew 26:26; 3 Luke 22:19; 4 1 Corinthians 11:26

2. The ancient Passover was also the annual ratification of the covenant between God and His people. As such it was itself a sacrifice both of expiation and thanksgiving; and summed up or represented all other covenant sacrifices. When our Lord substituted His Supper, He used language that included all, and specially referred to the solemn covenant transaction in which Moses divided the blood of atonement into two parts: half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar,1 to denote the propitiation of God; with the remainder he sprinkled all the people, to signify to them the Divine favor, and the book of the covenant2 also, to signify the ratification of the covenant of which that book was the record: This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you.3 These words of Moses our Lord connects with the new passover of His new covenant: Drink ye all of it; for this is My blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins.4 Obviously, the blessings of the better covenant, symbolized by the bread and wine, deliverance from guilt and life in Christ, are pledged and sealed to all who receive these tokens in faith. He who truly discerning the Lord's [sacrificial] body in the emblems, and shall examine himself as to his submission to the terms of the covenant, and then eateth and drinketh not unworthly,5 has his faith confirmed by this sacred pledge: can set to his own seal that all the blessings of redemption are his always and his while he thus receives the seal of the covenant. The Holy Spirit uses the sacramental ordinance for the assurance of faith: hence the meaning of the term SACRAMENT as applied to this solemnity 1 Exodus 9:19; 2 Hebrews 9:19; 3 Hebrews 9:20; 4 Matthew 26:17; Matthew 26:28; 5 1 Corinthians 11:28-29

3. But the ancient Passover was the rite that kept in annual remembrance the birth of the people as such and their community life in the bond of the covenant. When our Lord ordained His Supper, He distributed to each and laid emphasis on the ALL. So St. Paul makes this the external bond of unity: For we being many are one bread and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread. And this follows the declaration that the cup is the communion of the blood of Christ,1 and the bread the communion of the body of Christ. The Supper is the sacrament of union with Jesus the True Vine; and of union with one another in Him: hence it might seem that the elements represent not only the sacrificed body of Christ, but the spiritual body itself saved by that sacrifice and made part of Himself. The real bond of union, however, is not the bread and wine; it is the common participation of life in Christ by the Spirit. But the sacramental eating and drinking together is the outward and visible sign of that union. The Supper therefore is the perfect badge of common discipleship: the mutual pledge of all the offices of brotherly love. It is guarded by the most solemn sanctions. All who profess faith in Christ's atonement, who desire His salvation, and are willing to keep His laws, are invited to come, forbidden to remain absent. But God is the Judge. He was provoked to jealousy by those who partook of both the Lord's table and the table of devils.2 He smote with condemnation those who did eat and drink unworthily.3 The Church also must watch over the ordinance of its holy fellowship, and the individual must judge himself. After all vigilance is used the Lord's Supper in this world will never be without its Judas: it is the typical and imperfect

feast of a fellowship that will one day be perfect. Meanwhile, as the sacrament of unity in Christ and with Christ, it is termed by us, with Apostolical sanction, the COMMUNION 1 1 Corinthians 10:16-17; 2 1 Corinthians 10:21; 3 1 Corinthians 11:27

4. The notices scattered through the New Testament give us plain indications of the ritual of this ordinance. The elements, or constituents, are bread and wine:1 common bread and unadulterated wine. These elements were consecrated; the bread was solemnly broken, and the cup was blessed. The ordinance was called the breaking of bread,2 as if the distribution to each from one common loaf was preserved symbolically. The consecration was the setting apart to the most sacred possible use; the express thanksgiving for redemption commemorated by the bread and wine; and invocation of the grace signified

Each element was received separately, and by the act of each recipient. The communion was frequent:3 at first daily, certainly every Lord's Day. It is obvious that there is no precept on this subject, though there are two extremes which the language of the New Testament shuts out. Annual, or very occasional, celebration does not comport with the words As often as ye eat this bread,4 interpreted as they are by the signs of frequent communion in the early part of the Acts. On the other hand, St. Paul says, when ye come together into one place,5 or the congregation; which implies a formal assembly that could not be of daily recurrence. The ceremonial was simple: not for eating and drinking simply,6 but sacramental and symbolical. It was indeed connected sometimes with a preceding feast, the abuses of which are noted in the Epistle to the Corinthians, It was celebrated by the minister as Christ's representative: the bread which we break, the cup which we bless. But there was nothing priestly in the ministerial act, nor was the Lord's Supper, the Kuriakón deipnon, in any sense the one central act of worship:7 they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers.8 Lastly, it was observed as an ordinance perpetually binding: the Corinthian community was no exception to a general rule

11 Corinthians 10:15-17; 2Acts 2:42; 3Acts 2:46; 41 Corinthians 11:26; 51 Corinthians 11:20; 61 Corinthians 11:20-34; 7 1 Corinthians 11:20; 8 Acts 2:42 THE EUCHARIST IN HISTORICAL THEOLOGY The history of doctrine on this subject may be broadly viewed as falling under four heads: first, the Patristic period, when germs of error are seen growing up in teaching and ritual; secondly, the controversies which issued in the Tridentine doctrine of Rome; thirdly, the different formularies of the Reformation; and, lastly, the present aspect of the question throughout Christendom generally and especially in English theology

I. In the Patristic age, down to the first great controversy on the subject in the ninth century, we mark in every school of doctrine the signs of coming development. That development took two forms which afterwards united: respecting the sacramental presence in the Communion, and the sacrificial offering in the Eucharist, 1. As to the former, there was always much difference in expression. The earliest Fathers, while using very ambiguous language, never went beyond the figurative presence. So even Cyprian alludes to the Calix, quo sanguis Christi ostenditur. They speak of the Eucharist as being the body of Christ, and the heavenly food, but only as they speak of the Gospel and faith being the same. Down to Chrysostom there is no hint of the conversion of the substance, though Ignatius and Justin use the term meta-boloo. But both Ambrose and Chrysostom strike the note of future transubstantiation, though generally using the language of a

purer faith: the latter declares that the priest held in his hand what was the most adorable in heaven, and the former, Hoc quod conficimus corpus ex virgine est

2. The sacrificial idea was added to the Eucharist in the third century, though it entered furtively. At first it was an oblation of gratitude for the gifts of God in life as crowned in redemption: the people brought the bread and wine themselves: part was consecrated for the Eucharist proper, the remainder was left for the lovefeast and the use of the ministry This resemblance to the ancient oblations soon went further. Even Tertullian speaks of sacrifices for the dead; and Cyprian of the priest as offering in the place of Christ, Sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur. Then the Greek Fathers refer to the unbloody sacrifice, and even the sacrifice of propitiation. Cyprian and Augustine are content with the Sacrificii peracti memoria: but Chrysostom and others delight in representing the Eucharist as a repetition of the great oblation, though in such terms as only suggest the error of the future: suggesting it however in the plainest manner

II. During the Middle Ages this sacrament had the concentrated attention of the Schoolmen fixed upon it. There were two crises of controversy, and then the dogmatic construction of Mediaeval materials went steadily onwards towards Trent

1. In the middle of the ninth century Paschasius Eadbertus wrote a treatise in which the idea of Transubstantiation was first expressed: " that the earthly substance of the bread and wine, sacrificed by the virtue and consecration of the Spirit, are converted into the selfsame body and blood which the Blessed Virgin by the virtue of the same Spirit conceived and brought forth: only the corporeal appearance and taste remain for the exercise of faith." Eatramnus opposed him, asserting only the symbolical and denying the actual change and use of the elements

2. Precisely two hundred years later (1030) Berengarius wrote a treatise asserting the spiritual participation of the whole Christ, and the logical contradiction of the other theory. His protest was vain, and Gregory VII. compelled him to recant

3. Ecclesiastical sanction was given to the theory of TRANSUBSTANTIATION, as elaborated by Thomas Aquinas and Hildebert, by the fourth Lateran Council, under Innocent III, 1215. But the dogma took various forms. Aquinas supposed that the Divine power retained the accidents without any substance behind: thus the substance was not so much changed as annihilated, or there was a simple substitution instead of change; others adopted the notion of what is called IMPANATION: the unity of Divine and. human, following the analogy of the Incarnation. The consequences rapidly followed: the dogma of CONCOMITANCE, as laid down by Aquinas, was made the ground for withdrawing the cup from the laity, the blood being in the body and the bread sufficient; the sacrilege of which had been protested against from Leo the Great downwards. The feast of the Adoration of the Host, Hostia, or sacrifice, was established in 1264. The Mass—probably from the " Ite missa est" of the Western Liturgy—was decreed as the bloodless repetition of the one sacrifice for the benefit of quick and dead, at the same time with Transubstantiation, in 1215

4. The Council of Trent fixed the Roman dogma: it boldly affirms that the substance is gone and the accidents only remain, in the emblems; it teaches that the presentation to God of the elements is a propitiatory offering, and includes the body, soul, and Divinity of the Redeemer, though the transubstantiation itself is only of the bread and wine into the body and blood. Moreover, masses were sanctioned for the living and the dead, and for particular individuals, their effect being to

remove the temporal consequences of sin; and the private masses of the priests were permitted. The connection between Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass governs all the sacramental acts: the Elevation, the Adoration, the Reservation, the Circumgestation or procession which presents the Adorable Presence to the worship of all beholders

5. The Greek Church differed in some points: retaining Transubstantiation it imposed unleavened bread, gave the cup to the laity, and always administered to children, which last peculiarity the Western Church had gradually abandoned

III. Protestantism was mainly a revolt against this teaching: first against its abuses and then against its fundamental principles. We must glance at the forms it assumed after the Reformation

1. Lutheran Protestantism abolished—that is in its final form and standard, for the abolition was very gradual—the Sacrifice of the Mass, with its concomitants. It retained the Sacramental Presence of the body and blood of Christ, but not in the form of Transubstantiation: the sacramental union was the basis, and expressed by sub, in, and cum pane, under, in, and with the elements. Hence the term Consubstantiation, which required the doctrine of Ubiquity, or the presence everywhere of the glorified body of Christ, after a Divine and celestial manner. The reception of the elements is by all who partake the receiving of the corporeity of Christ: but to the advantage of believers only, as the sign and seal of remission of sins; to the unbeliever for condemnation. The impartation of Christ's glorified humanity is moreover for the benefit of the whole nature of man: for the nourishment of his soul and for the sustentation of the germ of the resurrection in the body. This view of the Lutheran doctrine is much developed in its later theology. The basis of the whole system is the assumption that the words of institution must be taken literally, not figuratively: This is My Body; this is My blood.1 And the Lutheran formularies elevate the sacrament to the very highest point as a means of grace: for the impartation of the forgiveness of sins; the strengthening of faith; union with Christ and each other; and all other benefits of the Passion. But the real distinction in the doctrine is its element of Consubstantiation; the very presence of the glorified body and blood of the Lord in, with, and under the elements, these still remaining only elements however, received by the communicants

1 Matthew 26:26

2. Reformed Protestantism diverged widely from the doctrine of Luther. It altogether gave up the Lutheran manducatio oralis, and substituted the manducatio realis sed spiritualis; it gave up therefore the hyperphysical or physical presence. It insisted that This is My body meant This SIGNIFIES My body;1 and that the sacrament was the sign and pledge of a spiritual union with the Head of the Church. But there were certain decided differences among the Reformed communions themselves

1 Matthew 26:26

(1.) Zwingli represented the view that tended towards the merely commemorative design; but his doctrine went beyond that: Christ to the contemplation of faith is not only subjectively but objectively present; and that spiritual eating of His heavenly body which is the appropriation of His atoning grace is a sacramental eating or receiving of the signs and seals of a present Savior. He rejected the " IN pane et vino," but would retain the "CUM pane et vino," and with this a specific sacramental blessing

(2.) Calvin went much nearer to Lutheranism. What the elements symbolized was to him the Person of the Redeemer as well as His atoning work; and His body as part of His person. This is received spiritually, but not the less on that account really: the communicant is lifted up by faith to heaven, and his soul is as surely invigorated by the spiritual body of Christ as his body by the emblems. With these views perhaps the Presbyterian Confession and certainly the Anglican substantially agree

(3.) The Remonstrant Arminians leaned rather to Zwingli than to Calvin; and perhaps laid more stress than either upon the commemorative design of the ordinance. But that they ought not to be classed with the Socinians and their descendants, who make the sacrament only a memorial of the death of Christ, whatever value that death may have, will appear from these words of the Remonstrant Confession: " The holy supper is the second sacred rite of the New Testament, instituted on the night of His betrayal, to celebrate the eucharistical and solemn commemoration of His death; in which believers, after they have duly examined themselves and tested their true faith, eat the holy bread publicly broken in the congregation, and at the same time drink the holy wine publicly poured out, to show forth with solemn thanksgivings the bloody death of Christ undergone for us (by which, as our bodies are sustained with meat and drink, or bread and wine, so our souls are nourished up into the hope of eternal life), and to testify publicly before God and His Church their own vivifying and spiritual fellowship with the crucified body and shed blood of Christ (or with Jesus Christ Himself crucified and dead for us), and with all the benefits obtained through the sacrifice of the Redeemer, as well as their mutual charity towards each other." It is true that the covenant seal is omitted; but we must remember what has been already adduced as to the Arminian doctrine of the sacraments generally IV. It remains that we refer to certain modern tendencies

1. Protestantism has renounced altogether the perversion of the Eucharist into a propitiatory sacrifice or mass; as also the perversion of the mystery of the spiritual presence into the sacrament of the impartation of the whole Christ through material elements that are only the accidents, or bread and wine without the substance. The Tridentine dogma is a fundamental violation of the symbolical and covenant character of the ordinance, and is refuted in its two main elements by all that has been shown to be the New-Testament doctrine

2. But the doctrine of the REAL PRESENCE—not the reality of His presence, accepted by all, but His PRESENTIA REALIS— is held by the Lutheran Church: which, however it may guard the doctrine by limiting the corporeal presence of our Lord to the elements in their use only, and denying any local circumscription of that presence, still errs against the truth of Scripture, that the Sacred Body is in heaven, and that the whole Christ, and not His glorified flesh only, is imparted spiritually through a sacramental union with Him by the Holy Spirit

3. The Anglican Church retains in her formularies nothing that favors the Romish error; but many of the elements of Lutheran, Calvinistic, and Zwinglian doctrine are combined The Twenty-eighth Article, however, ought to be decisive, that " the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner: and the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith." The modern theory of comprehension in the English Church allows all types of doctrine to be held: but by no just interpretation can the article of the Real Presence be attributed to that Church as represented by her authoritative formularies. The

Presbyterian teaching of the Westminster Confession is substantially the same, and conformed to the Scripture. But the notion that the sacrament is only a commemorative and representative rite is held by many of the religious communities of England

4. The true doctrine generally is that which bears in mind the design of the ordinance to be a sign to the believing Church of all the blessings purchased by the oblation of the one sacrifice for sins, and a seal to the believer of his constant and present interest in those blessings. Whatever other ends it subserves, as a perpetual memorial of the life and death of Christ, as a badge of union among Christian people, and as a sacred service in which all holy affections and purposes are quickened, it is also the abiding exhibition to the eye, in sensible emblems, of the blood of atonement and the bread of life, and a sure pledge to those who accept the propitiation, as it is offered to penitent and believing faith, of their present, and constant, and eternal heritage of life in Jesus, Each of the terms SIGN and SEAL must have its full meaning preserved, while they are made one to the eye and hand and experience of living faith. That which the sign represents and the seal pledges is a benefit proceeding from Christ which must not be separated from Christ Himself. It is the Spirit's function only as He is the Spirit of Jesus, —of His person as well as of His work, —to take the sacramental emblems and show their meaning to believers THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY For the discharge of the offices of worship towards God, and for the administration of the means of grace, an order has been set apart: men called to this function by the Holy Ghost, approved of the Church by its representatives, and ordained to office by their brethren in the same order. The history of this institution in the New Testament is very simple, and may be thus summed in its results. First, the ancient ministry of the Temple and priesthood was entirely abolished. Secondly, an irregular vocation appeared in ministerial gifts and functions which were transitional, adapted to the days of the foundation, yet patterns also for future extraordinary vocations according to the Spirit's wisdom and the exigencies of the Christian society. Lastly, the established constitution takes its final form as an Episcopal or Presbyterial body described not so much by name as by office, and in some respect conformed to the model of the Synagogue: its function being ministerial, in the Divine service; pastoral, in the spiritual care of the flock; and ruling, in the government of the Church. But, simple as the Scriptural arrangements are, they assume in historical theology the widest variety of developments THE UNIVERSAL PRIESTHOOD The ancient Temple, with its typical offerings, having been done away in Christ, an entire change takes place in the ministry of the congregation. There is one High Priest, who hath passed into the heavens; the whole Church is a spiritual temple; and all its living members are a sacrificing priesthood. Whatever the New Testament says concerning sacrifice in the new worship either has reference to the priestly character of all true believers, or is figuratively applied to the functions of the ministry. The universal priesthood of Christianity is, however, only the New-Testament fulfillment of the typical priesthood of the entire congregation of Israel. Its fundamental principle is most important, as teaching the true dignity and essential equality of individual Christians, and the corporate sanctity of the Church whose inalienable prerogatives are represented by its ministry. But it has been perverted to the undermining of a distinct ministerial order, and therefore requires qualifications and guards

Ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation:1 this word spoken to the ancient people is the foundation of what may be called the doctrine of the universal priesthood. Israel after the flesh was separated from the rest of the world as much as the sons of Levi were separated

from the rest of the Israelites. So the spiritual Israel in union with Christ are unitedly and singly taken out of the world; and it is in them that the type has its perfect accomplishment. All the Apostles rejoice in this truth, the influence of which pervades their language. St. John feels it when he says: Ye have an unction, chrisma, from the Holy One.2 St. James also when he calls religion a threeskeia,3 which alludes to a ceremonial service. St. Paul and St. Peter call upon believers to present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable,4 and to regard their whole life as spent in a spiritual house, where they offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ:5 their devotions and almsdeeds and good works being their priestly oblations. The doctrine thus established, guards against one abuse, and must itself be guarded from another almost equally perilous 1 Exodus 19:6; 2 1 John 2:20; 3 James 1:26-27; 4 Romans 12:1; 5 1 Peter 2:5

1. There is no separated order of priesthood in the new service: one is our Priest even Christ, and all we are priests through fellowship with Him, presenting through Him as our Representative our spiritual sacrifice.1 The sacerdotal theory of the Christian ministry is a dishonor to our Lord, and is specially condemned by the tenor of the Epistle to the Hebrews. We have an altar:2 but that altar is the Cross, which He hath consecrated that it may sanctify all our gifts. We all have it and surround it and may habitually minister before it 1 1 Peter 2:5; 2 Hebrews 13:10

2. Yet there is a separated ministry in the New Testament representing the universal priesthood. While the offices of religious worship are more or less common to all, in private and social and public assemblies, there is provision made for the responsible presentation of the Church's religious acts of service and discharge of the Church's teaching function. After St. Paul and St Peter have bidden all believers to present their living sacrifices,1,2 they go on both of them, and in the same passage, to speak of the ministries of prophecy, and teaching, and eldership. The Epistle to the Philippians illustrates the whole subject of the Apostolic use of sacerdotal language. At its close the pecuniary offering of that people is said to be a priestly sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God;3 in the beginning the bishops and deacons4 are representatives of the people; and in the middle St. Paul speaks of the Apostolic devotion of his own life as a priestly libation upon the sacrifice5 of their faith. The ancient Levitical service supplied figures for the new ministry; but the new ministry was an ordained function equally defined with that of the old priesthood which it superseded 1 Romans 12:1; 2 1 Peter 2:5; 3 Php 4:18; 4 Php 1:1; 5 Php 2:17 OFFICES EXTRAORDINARY AND TRANSITIONAL

Christianity was founded by the instrumentality of an extraordinary body of agents, preeminently endowed and authenticated. Their ministry was transitional; and, as such, continued for a season the various extraordinary administrations of the Holy Ghost under the old economy, not one of which passed away without being consummated and glorified in the service of the New Faith. While their function was designed to be transitory, it was at the same time to exhibit the types of an irregular vocation for special service according to the will of the Free Spirit in all ages wisely guiding the destinies of Christendom

References to all these extraordinary agents are dispersed through the Acts and the Epistles; but there are certain passages in which St. Paul enumerates and describes them

Comparing his words to the Ephesians with those to the Corinthians we gather that God set, that Christ gave1 as the fruit of His ascension, and that the Spirit divided to each,2 these several functions. We find the whole in an inverted order in these words: Now there are diversities of gifts,

but the same Spirit; and there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord; and there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all.3 While all are the energeemata of the One Triune God, they are the diakonaiai, or ministries of the Lord Jesus, and the charismata of the Holy Ghost. They are distinguished also as gifts of individual knowledge and faith; gifts of devotional utterance in new tongues; gifts of miraculous acts of healing; and gifts of administration in office. It is with these last, as including the others and yet surpassing them, that we have to do; and we must consider them first severally, and then in their common transitional character 1 Ephesians 4:11; 2 1 Corinthians 12:11; 3 1 Corinthians 12:4-6 1. There are three orders of this original and extraordinary service: Apostles, Prophets, and Evangelists

1. The APOSTOLIC office was pre-eminently a ministry ordained of the Lord Himself. He chose twelve, whom also He named Apostles.1 St. John, who never mentions the Apostles as such, save symbolically in the Apocalypse, gives nevertheless—as in regard to the sacraments, and the Ascension, and some other matters—the best definition of what he omits. As the Father hath sent Me, even so send I you:2 the idea of mission or embassage, which has its highest meaning in Christ and in the Holy Ghost,3 is attached to the Apostolate, but descends no lower. Apostles were ambassadors to the world; their credentials were a direct mission from the Lord in person, confirmed by miraculous powers. Their office was to preach the Gospel to all men, in the name of the Risen Lord, whose resurrection they proclaimed; and everywhere to lay the foundation of churches, or to sanction the foundation laid by others, to be the models for all the future. As the Spirit was the invisible representative of the Lord, so the Apostles were the visible. Their absolute authority is indicated in two ways: first, as teachers of Christianity, by word and writing, they had the gift of inspiration; and, secondly, as founders of the Church, they had the power of the keys, of binding and loosing, that is, of uttering the unchangeable decrees of ecclesiastical government. Their sway everywhere is seen to be uncontrolled, and from their word there is no appeal. They had, and could have, no successors: they form a body of men chosen to lay the foundation of the universal Church, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets,4 and to commit to it the final documents of Scripture. A succession of such men would not have been in harmony with the known will of Christ, which we may interpret as purposing to leave a Fellowship with a settled organization, and a finished doctrine, and a natural development under the supreme guidance of the Holy Ghost. But being dead they yet speak in their writings, which are the only representatives of the Apostolical company in the visible community. It is from St. Paul, the one Apostle of the Gentiles, that we gather our fullest information concerning the Apostolical prerogative 1 Luke 6:13; 2 John 20:21; 3 Hebrews 3:1; 4 Ephesians 2:20

2. The PROPHETS occupy a large place in the New-Testament history. They spoke, like the Apostles, under the direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost: not necessarily, or chiefly, predictions, but always utterances distinguished from ordinary teaching. Their function was a fulfillment of the Pentecostal promise: And on My servants and on My handmaidens I will pour out in those days of My Spirit; and they shall prophesy.1 These words teach us to expect an abundant effusion of this gift; and we find it accordingly. The Epistle to the Corinthians shows that it was common to men and women, that it was occasional and not the special endowment of an order, and that it sometimes pervaded the service of the congregation.2 But when St. Paul tells the Ephesians that they were built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets,3 he allows us to infer that there was a well-known body of men whose ordination was directly from the Spirit; to whom, though not

as a permanent class uttering revelations which were to be preserved, the truth was immediately revealed. This high prerogative of the new order is confirmed by the remarkable words of the same Epistle: As it is now revealed unto His holy Apostles and Prophets by the Spirit.4 1 Acts 2:14-18; 2 1 Corinthians 14:3; 1 Corinthians 14:24-25; 1 Corinthians 14:20; 3 Ephesians 2:20; 4 Ephesians 3:5

3. The link between Prophets and EVANGELISTS is given in the account of Timothy's ordination: According to the prophecies which went before on thee;1 and, Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy.2 Timothy is the type of this third order: the last charge to him of St. Paul, his superior, is: Do the work of an Evangelist, euangelistou, make full proof of thy ministry, diakonian.3 That ministry was the performance, in subordination to the Apostles, of the Apostolic offices of preaching everywhere the Gospel and founding churches. It was strictly subordinate, as is testified in the Acts by the Apostles' confirmation of their work through the bestowment of the Spirit, and by the plenary instructions given to Timothy and Titus by the Apostle who appointed them.4 It was an office that vanished with the apostolate on which it depended In due time the name was given to the writers of the Gospels which the first Evangelists preached: Eusebius seems to have been the first to give it this application, and it has been accepted by the consent of Christendom 1 1 Timothy 1:18; 2 1 Timothy 4:14; 3 2 Timothy 4:5; 4 Acts 8:14-15 II. The transitional character of these offices suggests their connection both with the past and with the future

1. By them the Old Testament was linked with the New. The human instruments in the foundation of both economies are men extraordinarily appointed and supernaturally endowed. The Apostles in the New Law answer to Moses in the Old; the Prophets have risen again, having begun at the advent of Christ and not ceased until the foundations of His kingdom were laid; and the Evangelists correspond with those great men who anciently combined the legislative and prophetic functions. But there is the difference which the universal mission of the Gospel introduced: the publishers of the Evangelical glad tidings were only predicted in the Old Testament 2. In their relation to the future, these offices have, in the strictest sense, passed away The Apostles have no successors. Their number was sealed: Twelve to represent the tribes of Israel, Matthias having been most solemnly added to complete their body when Judas fell from it; and One supernumerary introduced to represent the Gentile world. If others, such as Barnabas, seem to bear the name, a careful examination of the texts will show that they receive it only in an accommodated sense, or as appendages of the true Apostles. The prophetic office also has been withdrawn. And in the full meaning of the office there are no longer Evangelists, or men endowed with a delegated apostolical authority. But, though they passed away, their relations to early Christianity cannot be studied without leaving the impression that the same Spirit Who set them in the Church may reproduce their extraordinary influence without their names and without their miraculous endowments. We need no other Apostles, for the Apostolic body rules over us still; we need no Prophets, for the prophecy is sealed; but Evangelists, in the spirit and power of Apostles and Prophets, though not in their Spirit, —that is, not with their vocation—will always be needed while the earth is anywhere covered with the darkness of heathenism THE REGULAR MINISTRY The New Testament, especially in its latest documents, makes it certain that a regular and uniform ministerial constitution was appointed for the service of the Church after Apostolical supervision should be withdrawn. This ministry was divided into two offices: one, having more particularly the

care of the spiritual interests of the flock, and the other more particularly that of its temporal or quasi-temporal affairs. The former is the Pastorate, the latter the Diaconate; and these two have been generally retained, though with different names and varying functions, by most bodies of Christian people The term Ministry, diakonia, is the most comprehensive that can be used. It is sanctified by its application to the Lord Himself, Who announced that He came to minister,1 and was once called a Minister of the circumcision;2 it is used by St. Paul of the ministry generally; while it descends to the lowest office, to serve tables.3 The origin of the word is obscure; most probably it is to be derived from an obsolete diako or diooko, to run, connected with dioko, to hasten after. Conventionally it is limited in modern times to the pastoral office, or the ministry of the Word; which is only one of many instances illustrating the remarkable freedom with which the original terminology of ecclesiastical government has been dealt with in later ages. Generally it may be said that no one function as described in the New Testament finds its precise and unvaried representative in the modern Churches: a fact which should tend to lessen the confidence and mitigate the asperity of controversy concerning ecclesiastical principles 1 Matthew 20:28; 2 Romans 15:8; 3 Acts 6:2 THE PASTORAL OFFICE The terms employed to denote the ordinary spiritual office-bearers of the Christian community are in their English equivalents Presbyters or Elders, and Bishops or Overseers or Superintendents. These, however, constitute one order in the New Testament. The functions assigned to them are those of ministering the Word, and watching over the flock, and ruling the churches: they are accordingly called Teachers or Preachers, Pastors, and Rulers

NAMES The only official names of a permanent character are presbuteroi, and episkopoi: the former being far the more common

1. The New Testament uses these terms interchangeably for one and the same order of spiritual officers. The passages which prove this will also throw light upon the functions of this undivided order. St. Paul sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church, tous presbuterous,1 and at the close of his charge bids them take heed to the flock over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers or bishops, episkopous. In the Pastoral Epistles also the two names signify one order. Titus was left in Crete for this among other obvious and undeniable reasons, to ordain elders in every city;2 and as the first qualification of these elders his Superior says, A bishop must be blameless.3 So St. Peter affirms that the duty of the elders is to feed the flock, episkopountes, or taking the oversight.4 Hence, writing to the Philippians, the Apostle mentions only two orders of spiritual officers, the bishops and deacons,5 as also in his former Pastoral Epistle to Timothy 1 Acts 20:17; Acts 20:28; 2 Titus 1:5; Titus 1:7; 3 1 Peter 5:1-2; 4 Php 1:1; 5 1 Timothy 3:1; 1 Timothy 3:8

2. The differences between the terms are obvious. That of Elder had reference to age or dignity, and was derived from Judaism; that of Bishop to office, and was derived from the Greeks. There is therefore no office of eldership as such, but there is of course an episkopoo: this is mentioned once in a sad connection,1 and once as an object of desire.2 It is remarkable, however, that no Episcopate is alluded to, in the sense of a collective body of bishops; but once at least we read of a Christian Presbytery, as having ordained Timothy,3 after the pattern of the Jewish: pan to Presbuterion, all the estate of the elders,4 literally THE WHOLE PRESBYTERY. The Elders of Judaism were seniors in age, chosen as assessors in the Sanhedrim with high priests and scribes. The Elders of Christianity formed a body, generally but not always seniors in age, who presided

over the Christian community as the only directing and governing authority. The term Presbytery, therefore, runs up to the most reverend antiquity, and is invested with a dignity quite unique 1 Acts 1:20; 2 1 Timothy 3:1; 3 1 Timothy 4:14; 4 Acts 22:5

3. There are some traces of a pre-eminence given to one member of the Presbyterial body. During the New-Testament age the Apostles themselves were absolute in all churches and over all their affairs: the Evangelists representing their authority where it was delegated. But every corporate governing body must have a head, at least as Primus inter pares; and in the Apocalypse that one representative of the presbytery seems to be pointed out in the ANGEL who is addressed in each of the Epistles to the Seven Churches The term Angel is symbolical, probably like Stars, though in another sense: The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches.1 It may be said that this would be making the stars symbols of symbols; that the angels therefore must represent something more real than an ideal guardian of the flock. Allowing this, there are those who say that it symbolizes the ministry collectively, which is exceedingly probable; yet even then the individual term Angel, though not the name of an office, suggests the Divine sanction of an arch-presbyter within a single limited pastoral charge. But there is no clear and distinct indication of the appointment of any such authority as pertaining to a distinct order, such as we have seen revived in the present century; and certainly not as bearing the name of Bishop 1 Revelation 1:20

FUNCTIONS The three functions of dispensing the Word of doctrine, watching over the flock, and ruling in the congregation, are distinctly laid down especially in St. Paul’s Pastoral Epistles, to which in this connection it may be sufficient to refer as containing the sum and substance of New-Testament teaching on the subject

1. The ministration in Divine service includes the ordering of worship, administering the sacraments, and preaching the Word. Here the term Minister is especially appropriate: as angels are ministering spirits, so pastors are ministering men: but both as offering their liturgical service first to God and then from God. The responsibility of the due celebration of worship rests with the Ministry: the service, that is, whether of prayer or praise, which has been already described. As the representatives of the Divine will to the congregation, the duty of these spiritual officers is to administer the Sacraments, to preach the Gospel for conversion, and to teach the souls by their instrumentality converted. All this is in their commission, and for all this they must seek every Divine and human qualification. In the Gospels and Pastoral Epistles these endowments are, as might be expected, amply described

2. The responsibility of the pastoral care springs out of the former. The feeding of the flock is the instruction of its members, old and young; but it is also the vigilant distributive attention to all its interests in the whole economy of life. The undershepherds must imitate the Archipoimoon Who calleth his own sheep by name.1 For the general and particular care of the church the elders are responsible. But in this, as in the dispensation of the Word, and indeed in all their functions, they have the ministries of the whole congregation at their disposal, and cannot dispense with them. Among the gifts bestowed on the Church were the helps or antileémpseis2 and the New Testament exhibits Christians of all classes as being employed in the services of prayer, preaching, and care of the sick. But in all and over all the Presbytery have the supreme responsibility 1 John 10:3; 2 1 Corinthians 12:28

3. This pastoral relation passes naturally into what we have Scriptural authority for calling the spiritual government of the Church. Its ministers are called hagoumenoi, rulers or proestotes, presidents, and all its members are bidden to obey them that have the rule.1 This authority may be viewed under two aspects: first, as committed to them by the Chief Shepherd, to Whom alone they are finally responsible as representing Himself; and, secondly, as representing the authority of the congregation committed by its own formal delegation to its representatives

1 Hebrews 13:7

(1.) Such rule as they have is ordained of Christ, and the solemn sanctions of their responsibility are connected with the great day when they must give account to Him who now walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks and holdeth their seven stars in His right hand.1 The extent and objects of this authority are to be measured by the degree in which the Presbytery are the representatives of the ordinary ministerial authority of the Apostles, in governing the Church by maintaining and guarding the doctrines and laws of Christianity, by exercising discipline as to receiving and excluding the members of its fellowship, and by the general regulation of its affairs. That government of the body which was committed to the Apostles, they committed through Evangelists to faithful men,2 who should discharge their ordinary ministerial function when the guidance of inspiration ceased 1 Revelation 2:1; 2 2 Timothy 2:2

(2.) Their jurisdiction may be said also to be representative of that of the congregation itself. Though there is no power but of God, and the government of the ministry is included as ordained of God,1 there is a sense in which it is only the authority of the whole Church delegated to its ministers. The three Mediatorial offices are committed to the entire body of His people who are said to have received an unction from the Holy One,2 that is, the Christly anointing from the Christ: they have the doctrine of truth and know all things and can try the spirits;3 they are invested with the priestly function, so far as they have an altar and offer up spiritual sacrifices;4 and they are kings, a royal priesthood.5 But all that the Church has received as a corporate body from its Head it lodges again in a certain sense with its ministers: all, literally and without deduction. The body of the people have resigned to them the right to teach; they have deputed their elders to that office. As a congregation their priestly functions are in the hands of their ministers; though in discharging them these are no longer priests. And the rule of the flock they have given over by the Lord’s will to their ministerial superintendents 1 Romans 13:1; 2 1 John 2:20; 3 1 John 4:1; 4 Hebrews 13:10; 5 1 Peter 2:5; 1 Peter 2:9

4. This Presbyterial government is one and not divided. Distinctions between a Teaching and a Pastoral or Ruling Eldership have been established in various communities, as will be hereafter seen; but the Scripture does not sanction them, for it generally speaks of ministerial teaching as a necessary part of pastoral duty. Remember them that had the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God.1 That a bishop be didaktikos, didactic, or apt to teach,2 was spoken of by St. Paul as indispensable. Afterwards the Apostle says: let the elders that rule WELL be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and teaching.3 Very earnest elders must be doubly honored, with a doubtful side-glance at their ample sustenance: doubly if their excellence is in ruling, and still more if also in teaching 1 Hebrews 13:7; 2 1 Timothy 3:2; 3 1 Timothy 5:17

5. Lastly, these offices of the Presbytery have relation not only to individual churches but to congregations of churches. Neither in the Old Testament nor in the New is there anything to favor the supposition that a congregation was ever regarded as isolated and independent in its government. The unity of the churches as representing the one Church appears everywhere: whether in our Lord's use of the term—first, My church1 universal, then, tell it unto the church2 local—or in the Acts or in the Epistles or in the Revelation, where the seven churches which are in Asia3 refer to variety in unity. Everywhere we find Apostles representing the church, then pastors and teachers representing the congregation. The Ecclesiastical government of the future was sketched in the New Testament. We do not find the exact pattern shown us, but sufficient to indicate that there was in every region a bond of unity among the churches, and that, supposing the Apostles withdrawn, that bond was the Presbytery. In the Acts we have the first council at Jerusalem, and the assembly of elders at Miletus. With respect to the former we read: as they went through the cities, they delivered them the decrees for to keep, that were ordained of the Apostles and Elders which were at Jerusalem. And so were the churches established.4 With respect to the latter, St. Paul sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church.5 When they had come he proceeded to speak to them as representatives of Asia: Ye know, from the first day that I came into Asia. An entirely isolated or independent Christian community is unknown in the New Testament 1 Matthew 16:18; 2 Matthew 18:17; 3 Revelation 1:11; 4 Acts 16:4; 5 Acts 20:17-18 THE DIACONATE The first officers whose appointment is mentioned after Pentecost were set apart as helpers of the Apostles in the service of tables: the feasts and charities of the Church. The Seven originally designated were in all respects an extraordinary creation; but in due tune a distinct order is mentioned by the name of Deacons, whose vocation was, first, to assist the Presbyters in their several offices generally, and, secondly, as their assistants, to take charge of the sick and the poor. To the Deacons corresponded a much less prominent order of Deaconesses

1. The Seven were to the subsequent deacons what, as we have seen, the extraordinary ministers were to the ordinary. Their appointment was one of the results of the transitory community of goods; a temporary expedient out of which a permanent institution grew An outpouring of love altogether new and peculiar to the Christian fellowship demanded a service of which the ancient economy, temple or synagogue, had no type. Hence the men appointed to assist the Apostles were scarcely below them in spiritual endowments; and indeed added to these new functions the offices of preachers and evangelists and prophets. Certainly nothing in their duties corresponded with the Minister,1 hupeerétee of the Synagogue. As we read often of THE TWELVE, and more than once of THE SEVENTY, so once we read of THE SEVEN.2 1 Luke 4:20; 2 Acts 21:8

2. The later New Testament mentions the office and qualifications for the office in such a manner as to show that it was mainly though not exclusively secular: the deacon is not required to be apt to teach, and the good degree1 he is said to purchase is simply the higher more distinctively pastoral office to which the lower ministries sometimes led

They were an order common to all. Their first care was for the sick and poor; they dispersed the alms of which the Presbyters were the treasurers: and sent it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul.2 They were employed to serve tables:3 that is, to take order for the love feasts which at first were daily connected with the Lord's Supper. This, however, became gradually a less onerous service, and allowed more time for private and public instruction; so that

they were by degrees intermediaries between the elders and the people, just as the elders were intermediaries between the individual church and the churches elsewhere. St. Paul describes their duties in the vivid sketch he gives of their qualifications, among which are that they be grave, not double tongued, and holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience,4 these pointing to the offices of private instruction in smaller assemblies or classes and local preaching as connected with the function of the deacon. The service is often in modern times rendered without the name 1 1 Timothy 3:13; 2 Acts 11:30; 3 Acts 6:2; 4 1 Timothy 3:8-9

3. The deaconesses constituted a distinct order, originating in the necessity of the female portion of the congregation, especially among the Greeks. The office was strictly like that of the deacons so far as concerned the care of the poor and private instruction: it allowed women to minister in countless ways to the good of the saints under the direction of the elders. These seem to be referred to when St. Paul says: let not a widow be taken into the number—katalegesthoo, be enrolled—under threescore years old,1 though this limitation of age was not regarded as imperative and was afterwards relaxed. The other qualifications show how important was the office in the Apostle's judgment; and generally how extreme was the care taken as to the character of the women who discharged any functions in the congregation. But the deaconesses were more limited than the deacons as to public teaching. Let the women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak,2 lalein. There is nothing more severe in St. Paul's writings than what follows: it is a shame, aischron, for women to speak in the church Natural decorum was the ground of his interdict, which would apply, however, only to the more public assembly 1 1 Timothy 5:9-10; 2 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 VOCATION AND ORDINATION To this ministry there is a Divine vocation, of the Spirit; and a human, of the Church And this vocation is, in the New Testament, generally sealed by Ordination, through laying on of the hands of the Presbytery VOCATION, OR THE CALL To every service in the Christian fellowship there is a vocation: the ministerial, whether pastoral or more administrative, is connected with a special call, more emphatically marked than any other on account of its greater spiritual importance

1. The Divine call is supposed throughout the New Testament. As in the old economy no man taketh this honor unto himself but he that is called of God,1 so in the new our Lord chose the Twelve and the Seventy; He also gave His special sanction to the twelfth Apostle Matthias, and the thirteenth Paul. Of the ordinary elders it is said, all the flock, in the which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops.2 The Scripture gives no specific indication of the way in which the secret vocation of the Spirit shows itself; save that the person called must be one who has a spiritual experience of the Christian religion, must have the requisite gifts for the office to which he is called, and must purchase to himself his degree by the usefulness of his preparatory service, these being the fruits meet for his candidature. GRACE, first: Who reconciled us to Himself by [Jesus] Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation;3 GIFTS, secondly: the elder must be apt to teach; FRUIT, lastly: he must have used the office of a deacon well, or, literally, have ministered well.4 1 Hebrews 5:4; 2 Acts 20:28; 3 2 Corinthians 5:18; 4 1 Timothy 3:2-13

2. The vocation on the part of the church is much more expressly dwelt upon. Generally, the body of elders or ministers pronounces the call of the congregation: the Apostles set apart the deacons; the prophets and teachers1 announced their specific call to Paul and Barnabas; Timothy and Titus evidently had the same function as the representatives of the Apostles and of the Church. Obviously, this implies the consent and ratification of the people, though not their initiative: in the

case of the deacons, the judgment of the congregation was naturally more relied on and had more weight than in the case of the elders. But in neither case was the approval of the community omitted; though we are without the means of judging how in many instances their suffrages were obtained or their consent shown

1 Acts 13:1

ORDINATION

What is now called ordination took place generally by imposition of the hands of the Presbytery. This ceremony was borrowed from Judaism, being the symbol and medium of the appointment to office, and the pledge of all requisite grace for its discharge

1. It was the designation to the sacred business of their lives. They on whom hands were laid were set apart as the act of the congregation representatively performed. Hence it was the pledge on the part of the Church of the maintenance of those thus enrolled. Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel:1 an appointment of Christ which explains the Apostolic injunction to elders, that they feed the flock not for filthy lucre2 and that they must be given to hospitality.3 1 1 Corinthians 9:14; 2 1 Peter 5:2; 3 1 Timothy 3:2

2. On the part of the body of elders it was the formal admission of the ordained into their own number: With the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.1 Over this body Timothy himself presided when others were ordained: lay hands suddenly on noMan 1:2 In this case Timothy, like Titus, was the representative of the Apostle, who, however, seems himself to have presided over the Presbytery which ordained Timothy: stir up the gift of God, which is in thee through the laying on of my hands.3 From which it follows that in this function the Apostle was only the chief or President of the body, and did not supersede them 1 1 Timothy 4:14; 2 1 Timothy 5:22; 3 2 Timothy 1:6

3. On the part of the Spirit it was the pledge of His bestowment of grace for the discharge of the duties of the office: that gift, namely, which St. Paul speaks of as latent or inherent in Timothy. The laying on of the hands of the Apostles was never without a specific blessing: specific as to the blessing, specific also as to the Apostolic hands. But in every subsequent age the ministerial GIFT is imparted: not as a present mysterious virtue, or grace, or sacramental gift, but as the pledge in the soul of all needful strength and guidance for every emerging duty

HISTORICAL The development of ecclesiastical opinion as to the function and authority of the Ministry, or the Power of the Keys, has been bound up inseparably with the development of the idea of the Church itself. A few leading points only will require attention here: much of the subject belongs to Ecclesiastical history

I. The ante-Nicene distinction between Clergy and Laity contained the germ of the latter Hierarchy, with most of its accompanying errors, but with some striking peculiarities

1. The Apostolical Fathers began the development very early. The first of them, Clement of Rome, speaks of the laikos anthropos, the LAYMAN. Another, Ignatius, distinguishes bishop, presbytery, and deacon; and makes the bishop the centre of catholic unity. In the third century the ministry were called the CLERUS or CLERICI: both as the lot or portion of God, after the analogy of the Levitical tribe, and as the elect guides of the people Their rank was an ORDO SACERDOTALIS or

ECCLESIASTICUS; and here we have the origin of Clergy and Ecclesiastics. There were in this order two departments: the Ordines Majores, comprising the diaconate, the presbyterate and the episcopate, of Divine institution; the Ordines Minores, comprising all the lower functions from the sub-deacon to the door-keeper. During that period celibacy was optional. The consent of the people to the appointment of their pastors or bishops was required. Laymen were permitted to teach, though not in the presence of the clergy or without their consent. The episcopal institute as that of a distinct order sprang from ecclesiastical custom, based upon the necessity of continuing the Apostolic bond of unity. It became universal in the middle of the second century: but Irenaeus and Cyprian did much in the third to exalt the office to its highest dignity. The hierarchical idea, with its full complement of gradation in its train, was only by slow degrees fully developed. The Chorepiscopi, or country-bishops, were the lowest in episcopal rank The Metropolitans were the bishops of the leading cities: Antioch being the see for all Syria: Alexandria for Egypt; Rome for Italy and the West, In the fourth century the term Patriarch was attached to these, and to Constantinople and Jerusalem. the five ecclesiastical and political centers of the Roman Empire. To this system the East has adhered. The West has passed on to the Pontificate: the unity and consummation of all lower spiritual orders

2. These beginnings of error are to be traced in another direction. Almost every doctrinal deviation from the faith as a whole had its specific influence on the theory of the Christian ministry and its relation to the sacrifice of Christ. So far as Judaizing prevailed it brought back the sacrifice and the sacrificing priesthood with the sacrificial altar. The notion of a necessary external unity pointed to the supremacy of the bishop as the bond of union in the individual church, according to Ignatius; and of the supremacy of one bishop to secure the unity of all the churches. Even the wholesome doctrine of Catholicity, in opposition to schisms and heresy, tended the same way. The Power of the Keys, which originally guarded the purity of the fellowship, became to the clergy a great temptation; and tended, together with the exaggerated notion of the mysteries of which they had the keys, to invest their character with an unevangelical prerogative. In the second century two views predominated on this subject: one which made the binding and loosing identical with retaining and forgiving sin; and another which made it refer more generally to all ecclesiastical authority. Both, however, took a high stand on this subject. Cyprian asserted that the power of the keys was entrusted first to Peter and then to the other Apostles: making that difference between the two on which so great a superstructure has since been raised. The prescriptions of penance for Peccata Mortalia, or sins which threatened spiritual life, with the excommunication and reconciliation or reception into the Church again by absolution, did not before the time .of Augustine give the priest more than the authority of intercession as the representative of the congregation. Leo the Great did much to exalt the priestly independent power as his own official prerogative

Confession was not as yet made to the priests under obligation; and, while the binding and loosing had some reference to Divine forgiveness, it had more to certain ecclesiastical privileges. Public expulsions from the church on Ash-Wednesday, and public receptions afterwards on the Ascension Thursday, were usages of Rome in the fifth century. These gave place during the Middle Ages to private penance and private absolution

II. From the time of Constantine to the Reformation—twelve hundred years—there was a steady development of the germs of error observable in the first centuries. The main points only need be

here noted: to follow them out into their details belongs rather to ecclesiastical history

1. Though some of the highest authorities—Jerome, Chrysostom, Theodoret—asserted the original identity of bishops and presbyters, the episcopal order came to be regarded as representative of Christ and the Apostles, the special organs and instruments of the Holy Ghost. The bishops assumed the sole right to ordain, and in the West to confirm: their hands alone being supposed to communicate the sealing grace of the Gospel

2. When Christianity was made the religion of the empire the ministry of the Church became in the strictest sense a HIERARCHY. After A.D. 395, the Empire being divided into East and West, this Hierarchy had two heads: the Patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople

These long contended for the mastery; but Rome finally gained the victory. ROMA LOCUTA EST became the standard of judgment. The bishop of Rome claimed to be PAPA, POPE or PRIMATE of the whole Church, and to possess a dignity beyond that of all other bishops, though in order still only a bishop. Rome was the only Sedes Apostolica in the West, and was therefore the Latin Patriarchate. But the patriarchal system was oligarchical, not monarchical; and the four (Ecumenical Councils, —of Nicsea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon—made the bishop of Rome only PRIMUS INTER PARES among the patriarchs and bishops, just as every bishop was only Primus inter Pares among the presbyters. The separation of the Greek Church from the Latin is proof that the claim was never conceded. But it was reserved for the Reformation to bring the only good argument— that of Scripture—against the Hierarchical system, which as such seemed naturally to require a head. It is historical fact that Leo I., called the Great, who died A.D. 461, laid the firm foundations of the modern Papacy; and that Gregory I., who died A.D. 604, consolidated the system which culminated with Gregory VII. and Innocent III. in the Middle Ages

3. The Jewish priesthood and worship had gradually become the model of the Christian service. Ordination was accompanied with oil: this being to the special priesthood what baptism was to the universal priesthood, and, like baptism, having a Character Indelibilis By slow degrees every trace of popular election and confirmation passed away; and the clergy virtually became the church. Their sole administration of the sacraments, the number of which gradually increased, gave them more than the ancient Jewish priestly ascendancy. The central service of the Unbloody Sacrifice was waited on by priests clothed in vestments surpassing those of the Temple service in variety of symbolical meaning, and concentrated on them all the confidence and awe which the Levitical priesthood inspired

4. Seminaries of ministerial instruction—of which the Catechetical School at Alexandria was the model—abounded in the East from the fourth century. In the West there were many such schools privately set up by the bishops: such as the Monasterium Clericorum of Augustine. But the majority of the clergy were found to be profoundly ignorant as ages rolled on; although their ignorance was not so universal as is sometimes represented 5. The history of Monasticism is only indirectly connected with that of the ministry

Asceticism marked the private life of many of the clergy from the beginning; in the fourth century this became Anchoretism or hermit life separated from the world (anachoreo to retire, erouia a desert); thence came the coenobite or cloister life, or monasticism proper, the ascetic life organized (koinos bios vita communis, common life); and in the middle ages the monastic orders

were the climax. The vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience undertaken by them all were not of themselves ministerial. The monks were Religiosi but not therefore necessarily Clerici until the tenth century

6. The Mediaeval doctrine of the Keys underwent much development; and was finally completed by Thomas Aquinas. He distinguished between the Potestas (and the Clavis) Ordinis and the Potestas (and the Clavis) Jurisdictionis: the former opening heaven directly, the latter through the excommunication and absolution dispensed in the ecclesiastical forum. The sacramental power of the Keys became the centre of the sacrament of penance. Absolution, according to the final doctrine, procures forgiveness of sins. The opus operans of the penitent's repentance is followed by a pardon ex opere operato. But as judge in foro Dei, the priest can give absolution only as passing judgment on the reality of the penitence. This must after all, even in this doctrine of the Keys, be left conditional and with God alone

7. The full Roman Catholic doctrine places the administration of grace in the hands of an Ordo Sacerdotalis; an ecclesiastical hierarchy jure divino—with its Clerus Minor rising to the Clerus Major—which in its stricter sense the bishops really form, culminating in one visible Head, the successor of St. Peter and the representative of Christ on earth. The Church is represented by general councils, consisting of the collective episcopate summoned and presided over by the Pope, who has the Suprematus Jurisdictionis over all bishops. By the same Divine right the Church—the authority of which the Vatican Council of 1870 has really vested in its Head—has the Potestas Ordinis, magisterii and ministerii, the ordering of all doctrine and worship; the Potestas Jurisdictionis, that is the Potestas Clavium or Power of the Keys, the authority to dispose of all the treasures of the grace of Christ; the Potestas Regiminis, or religious authority over the world, which however is an authority always, to a greater or less extent, in conflict with the Potestas Saecularis

III. The general principle introduced by the Reformation was this, that the living church is the subject and source and centre of all power: that the Potestas Clavium, or Power of the Keys, was committed by Christ to the Apostles as His representatives, and through them to the universal body. The ministerial function or office is of Divine appointment; but its various forms and names are of human arrangement. As human and Divine at once, the ministry is representative of the whole Church, acting through it and in it and devolving upon it its rights

1. The Lutheran doctrine was higher than that of the Reformed. It connected the ministerial office more expressly with the KEYS. Its Ministerium Yerbi et Sacramentorum assigns to the pastor authority to preach the Gospel and remit sins. The following sentences from the Formularies will further explain: " Wherever the (true) Church is there is the right of administering the Gospel. Whence it is needful that the Church retain the right of calling, choosing, and ordaining ministers." " No one ought to teach in the Church or administer sacraments unless duly called." The connection between the Divine and human call is left indefinite: but "by Divine right bishops and rulers in the Church are to be obeyed. But if they teach or ordain contrary to the Word of God the Divine command forbids obedience." The Power of the Keys was regarded as consisting in preaching the Gospel or the terms of forgiveness; but both Luther and the Lutheran Standards and doctors left much room for confession and personal absolution of the minister

2. The Reformed type of doctrine was more rigorous. It laid more stress on ecclesiastical discipline, which it reckoned among the notes of the true Church; and rejected private confession and absolution altogether. It introduced a more stringent theory of the equality of pastors. By the side of the Ministri Docentes it placed the Ministri Ministrantes or Layelders who represented the Church in another sense and in matters of economy and discipline: set apart, and generally ordained, but not to teach

3. The Anglican doctrine of the Ministry, established at the Reformation, differed in some respects from both these. It retained Episcopacy with the name of Bishop and its special prerogatives: which Lutheranism disguised under the name of Superintendents and reduced it to a mere human expedient. It retained the Hierarchy, as adapted to a territorial and national religion. It went further than the other bodies in its interpretation of the Power of the Keys: using language as to the private absolution of the minister which at least in some of its services is more than merely declarative and significative. The presbyter is also styled priest by an equivocal abbreviation of the word. And, lastly, the Anglican doctrine assumes a special gift and influence of the Holy Spirit in ordination: though the strictly sacramental character of orders is denied, it lays much stress, and rightly so, on the express provision of grace provided for every ministerial function

IV. It will suffice to indicate the theological points involved in these several tendencies: as they affect, that is, doctrine concerning the Christian Ministry

1. The Hierarchical tendency has reached its natural consummation in the dogmatic definition of Papal Infallibility in 1870. The Pontiff, or Bishop of Rome, or Pope, speaking ex cathedra, that is, avowedly pronouncing the mind of the Church, or of the Spirit in the Church, is the infallible oracle of truth. Thus the long controversy as to the meaning of the Keys being given to St. Peter before they were given to the Apostolic company, seems to be settled, though in a manner inconsistent with other parts of the New Testament. It is forgotten that the special authority given to Peter, that of first opening the kingdom of heaven to Jews and Gentiles, and decreeing what was binding on the Church, and declaring the terms of forgiveness, —the Power of the Keys— was never arrogated by him for himself alone, or even as superior to the rest; and that he declared only that God made choice among us that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel,1 but no more. Moreover, Simon Peter is the only Apostle whose fallibility is expressly afterwards declared: he was to be blamed;2 and not a word is said of his primacy among the living Apostles being transmitted in any way whatever 1 Acts 15:7; 2 Galatians 2:11

2. From the time of the Reformation there has been a reaction against the Hierarchy which has in some communities gone to extremes. The QUAKERS, as a branch of the mystical family, swept away the ministry with the church and the sacraments: substituting, however, a secret and distinct influence of the Holy Ghost on His own selected organs for the benefit of the assembly. Thus the ministry in their teaching is a perpetual creation instead of a separated order. Their ecclesiastical government is simply the government of a society on principles of human expediency. More recently the PLYMOUTH BRETHREN, or BRETHREN, have arisen as the English branch of a community the principles of which are found in other lands and have never been unrepresented in the Church. This sect denounces the denominations of Christianity, falls back upon the Word of God, retains the sacraments, but rejects the separated pastorship, whether as a body or represented by an individual. The order of the ministry is renounced; and the teaching of the

Brotherhood is left to the Spirit's supply of gifts or charismata of teaching. This system utterly lacks the consistency of that of the Quakers. Both these Brethren and those Friends, however, are condemned by the Pastoral Epistles

3. The Catholic Apostolic Church strives to combine almost all the theories already alluded to. Its ministry is one of charismata, or gifts, restored according to the pattern in the Corinthian Epistles, and the Epistles of the Revelation. Its Power of the Keys is very similar to that of the Romanists. Its priestly service seeks to go back to the early ages; but halts midway

4. The importance of the Laity or general body of the congregation has been in modern times steadily more and more acknowledged. The abuse of terms which made the church and the clergy synonymous has passed away to a great extent; though its effect is not nor is it likely to be entirely removed. It is more and more generally acknowledged that laymen may act as Evangelists towards the world, and even as teachers within the church; that they may be employed in instruction of children, or as catechists; that they may read the Scriptures, publicly and privately; that they may sustain manifold offices more or less spiritual; that they may mainly direct the financial affairs of the community; and that they ought to be representatives in many ecclesiastical courts of the economics of the Church

There are excesses in this direction, which go to the extreme opposite of the hierarchical excesses. Such is the lay power which is retained by the constitution of the established church as a final appeal. Such is the lay-representation in the Presbyterian government proper: ruling elders, chosen for life, in the presbyteries, synods, and general assemblies

These presbyters—laymen in all other respects, and representatives of the lay element— have a voice in matters which affect the ministerial jurisdiction as such. This applies also to several of the minor Methodist bodies not professedly Presbyterian. In the congregational system the power of the Pastor as such is reduced to a very slight element in comparison with that of the body of the laity

5. Methodism is in regard to its doctrine and practice on this subject eminently high at once and free. It is Presbyterian as to the basis of its theory: its ministers are of one order only, its Conference being composed of representatives of the Presbytery of the body of Societies or Churches forming the Connexion. It is episcopal, after the earliest type

Augustine says (de Civ. xix. 19): Episcopatus nomen est operis, non honoris. Graecum est enim, atque inde ductum vocabulum, quod ille qui praeficitur eis, quibus praeficitur, superintendit, curam eorum, scilicet gerens, epi quippe super, skopos, intentio est: ergo, episkopein latine SUPERINTENDERE possumus dicere. Hence the Superintendent in English Methodism occupies precisely the position of early episcopacy and of episcopacy in some parts of Lutheranism. The name Bishop is retained in America, Methodism employs the laity in every diaconal function; though it does not retain the name deacon. It has its Leaders, Local Preachers, Poor Stewards, and Society Stewards, generally of the laity, male and female. It uses the service of women in private ministries, as catechists or teachers in Sunday-schools and leaders. It more carefully than most other religious bodies distinguishes the functions of the pastorate and of the laity: reserving for the final ministerial jurisdiction all questions that affect the Power of the Keys as left by Christ in His Church, The Methodist doctrine is that our Lord left the Keys—the general government of His

body, the special binding and loosing of authoritative decrees, and the reception and expulsion of its members—to the Church itself, as represented, however, by the men whom the Spirit would raise up with concurrence of the congregation to represent its authority THE CHURCH IN ITS RELATION TO THE WORLD, The Church of Christ, at once visible and invisible, exists to continue and perfect the work which He began. It is His organ for the preparation of His final kingdom. As such it has a twofold relation to those without: first, to maintain itself, in the midst of the world, as the depositary and witness of saving truth; secondly, to win the world to the obedience of Christ, as a Missionary Institute

Some of the topics here indicated have been already more or less fully discussed. Some of them must be reserved for Eschatology. But the view or the Administration of Redemption would not be complete without some general remarks here on the three branches of this subject THE WITNESS OF TRUTH The Church, as an organization in the world but not of it, is the depositary and guardian and witness of the truth. The truth which it has received is the standard of its faith and discipline; as it respects both individual Churches and union of Churches on whatever principles united

1. One of the chief prerogatives of the ancient people was that unto them were committed the oracles of God.1 The last declaration of St. Paul was that the house of God was the pillar and ground of the truth:2 a final testimony of the Apostle which, taken in all its large context, gives a most impressive view of the prerogative, responsibility, and dignity of the visible Church. These words go back to our Lord's which declare that the Spirit of the truth should abide with His people: the promise was not, by the very terms, limited to the Apostles. In this, as in all, they were representatives of the entire community for ever; representatives also of its permanent Ministry as a whole; besides being as Apostles a unique and pre-eminent class. The Church universal is the guardian of Scripture. There was a company of disciples prepared by the Word SPOKEN to receive the Word WRITTEN To show that the cause of God was not absolutely dependent on the complete Canon, that canon took centuries for its determination. But it was completed for the long future; and no individual church is faithful which either adds to or takes from the collection of the sacred oracles. Further it is also the guardian of the truth which is derived from Scripture

One end of its existence is contradiction of error as it arises: hence, the variations of dogmatic definition in Creeds and Formularies, The THREE CREEDS were, until the Reformation, a protest against all the errors of the world and of the Church itself. Since then it has pleased the Spirit that various communities should have their various STANDARDS, ARTICLES, or CONFESSIONS OF FAITH 1 Romans 3:2; 2 1 Timothy 3:15-16

2. The individual churches have been raised up to bear witness to sundry and several neglected elements of the truth: it being manifestly the mind of the Spirit that the denominations should act as mutual restraints and excitements. It was not His will that there should be uniformity in the Confessions of Christendom: when that uniformity existed for a season corruption was at the door. He administers the Work of Christ by unity in essentials, and mutual antagonism in things of less moment 3. But it is also the doctrine of Scripture that even the truth as it is in Jesus is not in this world to be revealed in all its fullness. For we know in part.1 A perfect church on earth is not one of the promises or predictions of Scripture. Nor is a finished and rounded scheme of Christian Theology to be expected. Before the exact text of Scripture shall have been determined, and all

errors eliminated out of the confessions, and a perfect system of doctrine unfolded, He will have come Who is Himself the truth and will not give His honor to another 1 1 Corinthians 13:9 THE MISSIONARY INSTITUTE The Church of Christ exists for the sake of the spread of the Gospel through the world: it is in virtue of its original commission a missionary body. Its obligation rests upon all individual Societies and all their members. With the fulfillment of this commission the functions of the Church will cease: the kingdom of Christ will more and more fully be revealed; until by His coming it will be translated from a kingdom of grace to a kingdom of glory The doctrine of Vocation has brought out the distinction of the Christian Church, that it has received a commission for all nations: partly, in contradistinction to the limitation of the Theocracy; partly as the term and goal of its own mission

1. Hence the preaching of the Gospel was the revelation of the mystery1 that the Gentiles should be called. And it is declared by our Lord that the Gospel is to be preached for a witness unto all nations,2 before He Himself should come: only for a testimony, however; for shall He find faith on the earth?3 It is true that in the history of the New Testament we find both principles only by degrees established. The admission of the Gentiles was very slowly acknowledged: not Jerusalem but Antioch was the missionary centre. The universal preaching of the Gospel was too soon assumed to have prepared for Christ's return 1 Romans 16:25; 2 Matthew 24:14; 3 Luke 18:8

2. No truth concerning the mission of Christianity has been so unfaithfully dealt with by the Church itself. Until the Roman Empire became Christian, missions, the record of which are lost, were vigorously conducted. But from that time down to the Reformation they were affected by two evils, which however did not hinder the spread of Christianity. The faith was propagated to a great extent by the agency of the civil power; it was diffused in its corrupt form, and sometimes by heretics: but the foundations were everywhere laid on which a better superstructure was afterwards upreared. The Reformation was not mindful enough of the missionary obligation: the English Church organized her missions only for the sake of her colonies in the seventeenth century; the Lutheran Church made energetic beginnings in the Danish mission; but it was the Romish Propaganda that showed most vigor

3. With this century began the Missionary era proper, after the preparations of the last century. It is now acknowledged by most Christian communities that the churches exist as such in order to the preparation and diffusion of the kingdom of Christ among men MISSIONARY SOCIETIES have everywhere sprung up, and are the glory of the present age In strange contrast with this is the fact that there are some communities, and many individuals in other communities, who believe that the diffusion of the Gospel is a subordinate matter; and that the destruction of His enemies and the establishment of His kingdom must be effected by the visible reappearance of the Lord, Who will for a thousand years before the end reign upon earth. But the uniform tenor of the New Testament declares that this Gospel is to be preached in all the earth, to every creature, and that Christ's presence with His missionary Church will continue always to the end of the world. This subject will return in the last section, that of Eschatology THE CHURCH AND THE KINGDOM The New Testament ends as it began, with the Kingdom of God and of Christ. That kingdom is the kingdom of heaven, as being in its origin not of this world. It is the kingdom of heaven on earth, as the spiritual authority that is already pervading human society. It is the kingdom of heaven also as the final form into which all the individual Churches of Christ upon earth shall melt. It is the kingdom absolutely as it is the one manifestation of Christ's mediatorial rule, which had its earlier

Old-Testament stage of preparation in Israel, its New-Testament fulfillment among Israel and the Gentiles, and will have its glorious consummation at the Coming of the Lord

1. The one basileia, or Kingdom, was established in Israel and as a THEOCRACY; which was really a CHRISTOCRACY in disguise, as the rulers in the ancient economy were types and representatives of Christ, Who in all ages and in all economies has ruled virtually or actually in the house of God

2. The kingdom of grace coincides with the Church, as it has been exhibited in its united visibility and invisibility, good and evil combined. The kingdom, during the interval until the coming of the Lord, is, however, mainly regarded as invisible. Our Lord speaks of it as already come: behold, the kingdom of God is within you;1 entos umon, among you invisibly. He that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he,2 John the Baptist. And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence—or is gotten by violence—and the violent take it by force.3 Concerning this, and some other similar passages, it is to be remembered that our Lord speaks by anticipation, as well as with reference to the present, and that His words are of prospective and abiding significance. Verily, I say unto you, that there be some of them that stand here which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power.4 This does not refer to the final Parousia, or the Redeemer's visible coming in His kingdom, but to the invisible coming in the kingdom of grace. This was the outpouring of the Spirit, the founding of the Church, and the revolution which laid waste the old Theocracy and its holy city. In this period of grace the Redeemer is KING OF RIGHTEOUSNESS,5 KING OF PEACE: His metropolis being Jerusalem, the city of the vision of peace 1 Luke 17:21; 2 Luke 7:28; 3 Matthew 11:12; 4 Mark 9:1; 5 Hebrews 7:2

3. The kingdom even now has in some respects the preeminence. It is the subject of most of our Lord's parables. Many of the prerogatives and privileges which are too often assigned to the Church really belong to the Kingdom. It is, for instance, the supreme good which must be sought and purchased, at the cost of all that we have: the treasure hid in a field, and the one pearl of great price.1 Whatever differences are here, the kingdom stands for Him who is the inestimable treasure in it: for you therefore which believe He is precious.2 The Benedictions of our Lord's commencement are the enjoyments of this kingdom; they begin and end with it: Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.3 It is not said of the Church that it is righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.4 The Evangelical proclamation is this gospel of the kingdom:5 one of the largest and most comprehensive sayings in the New Testament

Whatever glorious things are said of the Church, it after all carries with it a reference to the evil world whence it came: a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing.6 The kingdom is also mixed, for they shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend;7 but the predominant idea in it is that of the sphere of Christ's supreme sovereign manifestation

1Matthew 13:44; Matthew 13:46; 21 Peter 2:7; 3Matthew 5:3; Matthew 5:10; 4Romans 14:17; 5Matthew 24:14; 6Ephesians 5:27; 7Matthew 13:41

4. It is this kingdom that is an everlasting kingdom.1 It is now not yet revealed; and of it St. John, after having spoken of his apostleship to the Churches, says: I, John, who also am your brother

and companion in the tribulation and kingdom and patience in Jesus [Christ].2 We are all fellows in the patience of the kingdom in Jesus: en tee basileia kai hupomonee en leesou 1 Daniel 7:27; 2 Revelation 1:9

36. Vol 03 - Eschatology, or the Last Things

Eschatology, or the Last Things

ESCHATOLOGY.

PRELIMINARIES DEATH AND THE KINGDOM OF THE DEAD DEATH AND IMMORTALITY THE INTERMEDIATE STATE:

Scripture and Ecclesiastical History THE DAY OF CHRIST THE SECOND COMING Scriptural Doctrine and Historical Hypotheses THE RESURRECTION Scriptural and Historical THE GENERAL JUDGMENT The Judge; the Judged; the Judgment, with its Standards and Results THE CONSUMMATION END OF MEDIATORIAL KINGDOM Doctrine and Error SALVATION OF THE HUMAN RACE.

Theories:

Annihilation, Univrersalism, and Intermediate Tendencies NEW HEAVENS AND EARTH

ETERNAL LIFE

It has been seen, as we have proceeded, that all the facts, doctrines and ethics of theology point forward to one great Consummation. The things concerning Christ and His kingdom HAVE AN END. To exhibit that End, whether as universal or as individual, in one connected whole is the province of Eschatology, or the doctrine of the Last Things. It is obvious that all the lines here converge to one event, the Return of the Redeemer, which is the supreme Hope of His people: His Coming, however, cannot be disconnected from the Resurrection of all men and the universal Judgment. Before that final event of time, therefore, the destinies of Christ's cause belong to the other world as well as to this, and we have a profoundly interesting department of theology in Death and the Kingdom of the Dead: here time is strangely blended with eternity, though it is time still. After that final event, when time shall be no more, we have only the Consummation of all Divine designs and human destiny GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

Before entering on these topics in detail a few observations may be made on the general characteristics of this branch of theology, as it is specifically the prophetic part of the perfected revelation of Christianity

1. As such it is almost if not altogether shut up to the predictions of Christ and His Apostles. Of the future of mankind, whether in this world or in the next, we can from other sources know nothing. Men may speculate as to the destinies of the race, and argue as to what is to be by an induction of what has been 5 yet all this adds nothing to knowledge. But the very same authority which gives us our theology of the past and of the present gives us also our theology of the future. If we examine the New Testament carefully we find that a very large portion of it is occupied with THINGS TO COME. Our Lord Himself spoke very much of the future of His kingdom and Church. What He predicted in the hearing of His Apostles was to be brought to their remembrance.

Moreover, He said of the Holy Ghost, He will show you things to come.1 One remarkable form of the accomplishment of this prophecy was His own disclosure of the future to His Church by the Spirit through the last Evangelist: The revelation of Jesus which God gave unto Him to show unto His servants things which must shortly come to pass.2 1 John 16:13; 2 Revelation 1:1

2. There is an analogy between the Old-Testament prophecies of what were then the Last Things and those of the New Testament. In ancient times the prophets enquired and searched diligently . . . searching what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify.1 The same may be said of their successors the Apostles. There is throughout evidence that the law of disciplinary reserve which governs the prophetic part of Divine revelation rules with scarcely any relaxation. What the First Coming of the Messiah was to the ancient saints His Second Coming is to us: we have the same certain but indefinite future; very much more clearly outlined as to its great events, but equally undefined as to times and seasons, and vanishing into equal if not deeper mystery. It might have been expected that it would be otherwise; and that the coming of the Object of all prophecy would have introduced a new order of prediction, leaving no room for uncertainty or error as to the future. But it is far otherwise. A few words, here and there spoken, might have precluded a thousand controversies. But they are unspoken. As the Master of Wisdom said in the older and more immature economy it is the glory of God to conceal a thing,2 the glory of His wisdom; so still the honor of kings is to search out a matter, and all the Lord's people have this royal prerogative. From beginning to end the law of revelation is probationary: man's original sin of penetrating to forbidden knowledge seems to be remembered in the Divine economy of discipline. While on all points that concern probation the teaching is distinct and sufficient, nothing is disclosed for the gratification of curiosity. From the Apostles' first question, Lord, dost Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?3 there has been constant evidence of the error of the Church to speculate unduly: sometimes in fanciful, sometimes in tragic, sometimes in sentimental outlines the future of Christianity has been sketched with more or less of confident temerity. The Saviour's answer, It is not for you to know [the] times or [the] seasons, which the Father hath set in His own power,4 is of wide and unlimited application. We are taught that we must be content to leave some portions of the unknown future in their obscurity; and to muse without definitions before the unlifted veil: remembering that for us it may be lifted even while we are musing. This is a severe discipline, especially to the theologian, who delights in a clear confession of faith, and is sorely tempted to aim at the same formal analysis of the Last Things as he has been able to give of the work of Christ finished on earth and of the present administration of the Holy Spirit. He would fain weave into a system the scattered hints of prophecy. But nothing is more certain than that the Holy Ghost does not encourage this desire: prophetic theology can hardly be dogmatic 1 1 Peter 1:10-11; 2 Proverbs 25:2; 3 Acts 1:6; 4 Acts 1:7

3. Meanwhile, it is equally certain that there is a peculiar blessing attached to the humble, patient, and earnest study of the dread realities of the future. Eschatology, or the doctrine of the Last Things, appeals to certain principles and instincts of our nature which it alone has power to touch. There are elements in the constitution of man the cultivation of which is of great importance to religious discipline; and their education is almost entirely dependent on this branch of subjects. These have also an irresistible attraction to all classes, especially in times of sorrow and in advancing life; and their very indefiniteness and obscurity and unsearchable mystery enhance that attraction. Moreover, a considerable range of the ethics of Christianity grows out of the

contemplation of future destiny and preparation for it. Hence there is the amplest encouragement to the study of these things, though there is no encouragement to the systematic, or, as it were, scientific arrangement of them. It is left on record as a general principle that Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of the prophecy:1 not blessed because either reader or hearer will ever know the times and the seasons which symbolically expand before the vision; but blessed because this kind of meditation tends to withdraw his mind from all lower interests and will keep him at the Saviour's feet in the attitude of adoring expectation, humility, and trust 1 Revelation 1:3

4. The methods of analysis that may be adopted are many, and will be shaped variously according to the bias and prepossessions of the theologian: especially his bias on the subject of the Millennial future glory of the Church and the second coming of the Lord

Some are so prejudiced against the perversions of Millenarianism that they place the Lord's return generally under His judicial office and thus rob Eschatology of its keystone

Others are so bewitched by that one theme that they virtually divide redemption into two sections: the first and the second Coming of Christ. Certainly, the return of its Head as such is the undying hope of the militant body on earth. It is the vanishing point of all Christian expectation. It commands the great futurity; but in theological order Death and Hades belong to the preparations for His advent; the Coming itself precedes the resurrection and judgment; and beyond it, though still suffused with its glory, opens out the Consummation of all things DEATH AND THE KINGDOM OF THE DEAD

Death is a word of large meaning in theology. There is a sense in which it does not belong to the Last Things, being one of the first facts in the religious history of mankind As the penalty of sin it has already been considered. Here it must be viewed chiefly, though not exclusively, as the last event in the probation of man translated by it into the region of the dead, which in its relation to the coming of Christ and the final consummation may be called an Intermediate State DEATH AND IMMORTALITY

Death spiritual and eternal will reappear at a later stage in Eschatology. Its physical aspect is here more directly concerned; and it must be regarded, first, as in a certain sense abolished by the death of Christ, but, secondly, as nevertheless continued in the discipline of the Gospel and made the minister of the Divine purpose. All is summed up in one word, that Christianity has taught us what death is as the result of sin under the economy of grace

DEATH

It is said by St Paul that Jesus Christ hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel.1 Death is in fact abolished by being also brought under the light by the same revelation: that is, Christianity has finally and fully explained what death is, and under what conditions the human race is subjected to it notwithstanding the great redemption 1 2 Timothy 1:10

1. Death in the new dispensation never means the opposite of existence: were it such, it could not be said to be annihilated, unless indeed the Saviour's intervention as the Second Adam gave back to mankind an existence that would otherwise have been forfeited. But it is never said that existence was forfeited by sin: the threatening of death that took effect upon disobedience was

primarily a separation of the soul or spirit from the body. The body began at once to sink towards the earth whence it came; and the spirit began to know those preliminary infirmities that issue in the agony of the final severance, the most violent and unnatural experience to which in this life transgression has made man subject: the physical type of the separation of the soul from God

2. This is the only death that can befall the soul, so far at least as the sentence pronounced upon the sinner is concerned. The immortality or continued conscious existence of man's spirit is everywhere assumed in Scripture and nowhere proved. And, so far as the doctrine of death is before us, continued existence and immortality are one. The absolute immortality of the human spirit is not in question as yet. Absolute immortality, indeed, can never be matter of argument. God only hath immortality;2 if He has given it to man as such it must be as something that is made inherent in man's reflection of God's likeness The Christian doctrine of death leaves untouched the natural immortality of mankind The arguments in its favor, in their variety and their various degrees of strength, belong to the subject of the Divine Image in man. Those which rest upon the immateriality of the soul and its indivisibility, upon its high aspirations, upon its universal instincts, are valid pleas against the materialist; but all subordinate to the original testimony given to the stamp of the Creator's own nature impressed upon it. Apart from that no argument demonstrates the immortality of the soul, even as there is none that proves the being of God. But we have only now to make emphatic the fact that the Christian doctrine of death implies that immortality: first, because nothing is said to the contrary when the separation of soul and body is spoken of; and, secondly, because death is said to be in its widest meaning done away in Christ 1 1 Timothy 6:16

DEATH ABOLISHED Death as a penalty, whether physically or spiritually considered, is abolished in the Gospel of our redemption

1. In the widest possible sense it is negatived or done away. There is no restriction in the words used to signify the Saviour's endurance of death in the stead of the human race. He underwent in dying the curse of the law; received the wages of sin not due to Himself; and all mankind are delivered as one whole from the original sentence. For the entire family of Adam it is virtually and provisionally abolished. Our Lord tasted death for everyMan 1:1huper pantos. He removed this specific condemnation from the race; and if annihilation were, in any sense whatever, the meaning of the sentence, the Substitute of man, the Second Adam, abolished it. But we have no hint in Scripture that annihilation was the import of the original sentence. It was rather the separation of the soul from the body and of both from God; and that as an absolute sentence upon mankind was reversed and abolished

1 Hebrews 2:9

2. It is really abolished to all who are found in Christ. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life:1 the opposite of that wrath of God which abideth on the unbeliever. He that hath the Son hath life.2 It is true that the abolition is conditional, and gradually revealed both in the soul and in the body; even as the full revelation of the death from which we are saved is gradual We were saved by hope:3 this law runs through the Christian economy; we receive only the firstfruits, every blessing and every deliverance being at best given in its earnest alone until the redemption of the purchased possession.4 But the day will come when every trace of this sentence shall be effaced. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.5 It was also the first enemy destroyed 1 John 3:36; 2 1 John 5:12; 3 Romans 8:24; 4 Ephesians 1:14; 5 1 Corinthians 15:26 DEATH A

Death, in its more limited sense as physical, is taken up into the Evangelical economy: continued as an ordinance for the human race, and as a discipline for every believer. It is this death which specifically belongs to Eschatology

1. The continuance of death is bound up with the Divine purposes touching the development and the destiny of mankind. What that development would have been without sin we know not: all that we know of the eternal counsel concerning the human species deals with it as a race continued through a succession of dying generations. It is appointed unto men once to die1 in their federal relation with the first Adam, that they may rise again with the Last. The economy of redemption which was established before the gates of Paradise opened on human history retains death as a law in the government of the world. This is all that can be affirmed; and speculation beyond these limits finds no encouragement. It may be said that this was, in a certain sense, letting the original tendency go on, inasmuch as physical death had reigned upon the earth before Adam was created; and further that the earth was adapted to the condition of man as living and dying. Such a view requires us to believe that without sin man would have risen above the general law: the tree of life being a sign of what might have been a sinless immortality. But this, like the question whether or not the Son would have become incarnate had the Fall not taken place, is left in profound silence in the holy record Suffice it that when the history of the world has reached its last term death shall cease

Mankind waits till the Deliverer comes for its emancipation. Then will He prove Himself the Lord and Abolisher of death by superseding and displacing it; and the last undying generation will give evidence that this firstborn of sin was only assumed into the Divine counsel for human development within the limits of time

1 Hebrews 9:27

2. Christian death is abundantly and most impressively brought to light as not abolished absolutely; but as taken up into the Divine plan for the individual just as it is for the race

(1.) It enters into the probationary discipline of believers. Hence it is hallowed and dignified as part of the fellowship of their lot with Christ. For if we died with Him, we shall also live with Him:1 here the suffering of death physical must be included; the sacred graces of our Lord’s dying experience must be reflected in the dying of His saints That unknown element in His suffering which negatived the sinner’s eternal death is of necessity unshared, but His physical surrender to death admits us to a fellowship with it Hence it is the last sacrifice of Christian obedience; according to the Apostle’s word, I am now ready to be offered.2 This refers to less or to more than martyrdom, specifically so called: in a sense all death is a martyrdom, by which the servants of Christ testify of redemption and glorify God.3 There is no grace of Christian life which is not made perfect in death: not that death is the minister of the Spirit to destroy sin, but the last earthly act and oblation of the sinless spirit in which the sacrifice of all becomes perfect in one. Therefore it is the appointed end of human probation. Other methods of placing a limit to the probationary career, especially in relation to the unfallen creature, may be imagined: this is the appointed end since sin and redemption began. The very execution of doom is made the goal of destiny, in which the sentence is finally reversed. And thus in a certain sense death is the preliminary and decisive judgment for

every individual on earth who knows the connection between sin and deliverance 1 2 Timothy 2:11; 2 2 Timothy 4:6; 3 John 21:19 (2.) Finally, Christian death is transfigured into a departure from this life to another

Every former name is retained in the dispensation of the Gospel; no new one, strictly speaking, is added; but all are sanctified to a higher character and put on their perfection

It is Dissolution, but not as limited to the idea of going down to the dust of death: it is the separation of spirit and body; the body being also dissolved into its component elements in the earth, and the spirit, no longer a soul, gathered to the fathers and to Christ, returning to God who gave it, but not dissolved into the abyss of Deity. The Christian thought of being unclothed1 is an advance upon any former revelation: the body is only the clothing which, folded in the grave, will be hereafter re-fashioned for the naked spirit

Death is rest,2 as of old: but rest in the ceaseless service of the Lord. It is sleep; but it is sleep in Jesus.3 It is still the penalty of sin; but no longer only a penalty. For to those who believe in Jesus death is no more death: not only is its sting gone, but itself is already as to its terror—which is its shadow following it, the Second Death— annihilated; whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die.4 Finally, it is more than the Old- Testament going the way of all the earth:5 it is a Departure or Decease, for these two words are one. Such it was in the case of our Lord: Moses and Elias spoke of the Decease, teen exodon, which He should accomplish at Jerusalem.6 And among the last allusions to death in the New Testament it is regarded as only a removal to another sphere: the time of my departure is at hand;7 which is the simplest and sublimest description of it given to our faith and our hope 12 Corinthians 5:4; 22 Thessalonians 1:7; 31 Thessalonians 4:14; 4John 11:26; 5Joshua 23:14; 6Luke 9:31; 72 Timothy 4:6 THE INTERMEDIATE STATE

Throughout the Scriptures, from Genesis to Revelation, the departed souls of men are represented as congregating in one vast receptacle, the interior conditions of which differ much in the Two Testaments and vary in each respectively. On their estate the light steadily increases as revelation proceeds, though even its final disclosures leave much obscurity which only the Lord’s coming will remove. It is, however, made certain that the intermediate state is under the special control of the Redeemer as the Lord of all the dead who have ever passed from the world; that those who have departed in unbelief are in a condition of imprisonment waiting for the final judgment, while those who have died in the faith are in Paradise, or rather with Christ, waiting for their consummation; and that the universal resurrection win put an end both to death and to the state of the disembodied dead. Some few hints which the New Testament gives as to the conscious personality of the subjects of the Lord’s kingdom in Hades have been made the basis of doctrinal determinations and ecclesiastical institutions and speculative theories which belong to the department of historical theology

OLD TESTAMENT

1. In the earlier revelation the collective inhabitants of the earth pass through death into a state or place which is to the spirit what the grave is to the body. This has one invariable name: sheol, shaowl, the house appointed for all living.1 The word was derived from a root signifying to be hollow; or from one denoting a chasm or abyss; or from a third, meaning to ask, in reference to its insatiable demand for souls. It is to be distinguished from the grave, which is often used in the

English translation. For instance, when Jacob says, I will go down into the grave unto my son mourning,2 the word is shaolaah, unto Sheol: Joseph was supposed not to be in any grave. The patriarchs went to their forefathers: Abraham, as afterwards Aaron, was gathered unto his people;3,4 they were gathered to their people, but in the great majority of cases were not buried with them From the beginning the hollow place in which the body was deposited had neither more nor less reality than the Sheol or under-world, supposed to be local and within the earth, into which all souls descended, retaining their conscious personality. They are never called souls, however, or spirits; but, in writings later than those of Moses, rephaim, signifying languid, or nerveless, or shadowy beings: different therefore from the giants of the Pentateuch 1 Job 30:23; 2 Genesis 37:35; 3 Genesis 25:8; 4 Numbers 20:24

2. It is moreover in the earlier books, and indeed throughout the canonical Old Testament, one indistinguishable receptacle of a11 the dead; generally a place of terror and gloom cut off from God, not without conscious and continued existence, but with only a feeble hold of life; brightened to the righteous by hope, but by fluctuating hope The testimonies of Job and of Hezekiah represent the darkest aspect of Sheol. Are not my days few? Cease then, and let me alone, that I may take comfort a little, before I go whence I shall not return, even to the land of darkness and the shadow of death; a land of darkness, as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness.1 We hear Job's own answer to his desponding question, If a man die, shall he live again? that his sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not, . . . but his flesh upon him shall have pain, and his soul within him shall mourn.2 Hezekiah's forecast is as gloomy as Job's: The grave cannot praise Thee; death cannot celebrate Thee,3 Job's anticipation, yet in my flesh shall I see God,4 finds no permanent and true fulfillment this side of the resurrection 1 Job 10:20-22; 2 Job 14:14; Job 14:21-22; 3 Isaiah 38:18; 4 Job 19:26

3. There are hints, though only hints, of distinct allotments of doom. While the Old Testament everywhere assigns to the departed a continued existence — immortality, therefore, as making the spirit survive bodily death—it preserves a silence almost unbroken as to retribution after the probation of life. But the one Pit, bowr, into which all alike descend has its lower depths. The servants of God, faithful to His covenant, have in Him their portion, and therefore He is their God, not the God of the dead but of the living;1 but in the mystery of gradual revelation the secret of the prison is reserved for the coming of Christ. Of Enoch it is not said that he died; he was not, for God took him;2 but this was only a standing testimony, that death is not essential to the development of man

Balaam's wish, to die the death of the righteous,3 is indefinite, and did not necessarily refer to anything beyond this world. But many of the prayers of the Psalmists more than hint at a difference hereafter: draw me not away with the wicked, and with the workers of iniquity.4 The speculations of the Preacher point to the same difference; as one, however, that the day of judgment will bring to light: for all these things God will bring thee into judgment.5 1 Matthew 22:32; 2 Genesis 5:24; 3 Numbers 23:10; 4 Psalms 28:3; 5 Ecclesiastes 11:9

NEW TESTAMENT In the New Testament there is a resumption and very remarkable development of doctrine concerning the state of the dead in the interval preceding the final resurrection

1. Before His own resurrection our Lord adopted the ancient description of the unseen world, using the term hades, which the Septuagint had invariably employed as the Greek representative of the Hebrew sheol. But He subdivided it into two departments: the place of Lazarus He called, with the Jews, Abraham's bosom;1 but He does not place the rich man in Gehenna, which had also become the Rabbinical term for the place of final woe In Hades he lifted up his eyes, being in torments; but in the same Hades he could see Lazarus though afar off. Our Lord this once uses the word in the Old-Testament meaning of the general receptacle of departed souls. But elsewhere He employs it to signify the empire of ruin and desolation and subversion of human life: in this sense He said of His Church, The gates of Hades shall not prevail against it;2 and of the doomed city of Galilee, thou shall be brought down to Hades.3 In the Apocalypse the Lord returns to the old idea of one vast disembodied realm: I have the keys of Hades and of death,4 though, as in the Dives-parable, with a predominant reference to the condemned prison-house in it. This last the Lord calls Gehenna again and again, as in that ever-memorable word concerning the fire of hell, that never shall be quenched;5 and in that solemn denunciation of the Pharisees which seems to make this hell a state, like eternal life, which may be the present characteristic of the soul: twofold more the child of hell,6 or Gehenna, than yourselves. Before His departure our Lord gave a new designation to the realm of the blessed in Hades: Today shall thou be with Me in Paradise.7 1 Luke 16:22-23; 2 Matthew 16:18; 3 Matthew 11:23; 4 Revelation 1:18; 5 Mark 9:43; 6 Matthew 23:15; 7 Luke 23:43

2. What had been the descent of the Redeemer into Hades has been elsewhere considered: it introduced, not only a new state of things in the under-world, but a new terminology for the intermediate state. The Paradise and Gehenna of the Gospels— figurative names, one taken from the original Garden, and the other from the Valley of Hinnom where the perpetual fire burnt up the refuse—reappear, with Hades including both; but neither of them emphatically, nor with certain reference to the intermediate condition of souls. The place is not described so much as the state or character and employments of its occupants The Lord's victory over death and glorious descent has changed the whole scene. The saints who are in life and death united to Him are spoken of as those who sleep in Jesus:1 He is their koimeethentas, or Cemetery, where sleep is life while life is sleep. The current language of the Epistles refers to their death as departure to be with Christ,2 with right to an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens,3 and the attainment of an almost consummate state in the general assembly and church of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven, where are the spirits of just men made perfect.4 All this seems inconsistent with a locality in any sense corresponding to the under-world of Sheol: in fact the term Hades would be all but lost, save in the symbolical Apocalypse, were it not for the explicit declaration that in the resurrection its victory will be taken away: 0 Hades, where is thy victory!5 With the Lord's resurrection Paradise seems to have risen also into a lower heaven: as it were the third heaven6 if not the seventh. Of the elevation of Paradise some hint was given when many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after His resurrection:7 these may have been the mysterious symbolical firstfruits, whose spirits reunited to their bodies appeared unto many on their way with Christ from Paradise to heaven. The disembodied ungodly are never spoken of save as being generally or by implication in Hades. It is said in the Apocalypse that death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death.8 As symbols they vanish for ever; and the real persons they represent know the second death in the lake of fire,9 which is the same as the Gehenna of fire in the Gospel. In the language of Christendom these terms have been exchanged

for hell, which is moreover often regarded as, in its full terror, existing for the lost before the judgment. St. Peter uses yet another word, when he speaks of the spirits in prison10 to whom the Savior preached or announced the accomplishment of redemption

1 1 Thessalonians 4:14; 2 Php 1:23; 3 2 Corinthians 5:1; 4 Hebrews 12:23; 5 1 Corinthians 12:2; 6 2 Corinthians 12:2; 7 Matthew 27:52-53; 8 Revelation 20:14; 9 Mark 9:43; 10 1 Peter 3:19-20

HISTORICAL

Historical theology has here a wide domain, especially if we include, as we ought, the entire range of the opinions and practices of mankind beyond the pale of revelation EXTRA-BIBLICAL BELIEFS

Comparative Theology gives ample evidence that all, or almost all, the religious systems of antiquity have had their Region of the Dead. From east and west and north and south all travel thither in their various systems of belief. In the east, however, what we call the intermediate state was distorted into an ever-recurring series of transmigrations until the final heaven of souls was reached in a state of absorption into God. In all the mythologies with which revelation came into contact there is an estate and a place and a government of the lower world. So was it in Egyptian eschatology. So also in the classical Hades or Plutus, and Persephone or Proserpine received the dead, the Inferi, into Hades or Tartarus below it, and into the Elysian fields: their jurisdiction being that of strict retribution. The speculations of mythology were far more definite than those of the Old Testament in one sense; but had not in them the distant Messianic hope that lightened the gloom of the Hebrew Sheol. And, when the True Light appeared, the dim and distorted shadows projected upon the future all vanished: giving place to a clear and definite doctrine of Hades, as linked with the probationary past still, but now declared to be the threshold only of the resurrection and eternity, neither of which was in distinct human conception until the Gospel brought them out of darkness into light CHRISTIAN BELIEF AND SPECULATION Many and various speculations of Christian Theology, which have not been confined to any particular age, may be noticed

1. That of the SLEEP OF THE SOUL in the Intermediate state very early prevailed: strictly speaking, it was the sleep of the whole man reduced for a season to nonentity, to be called into existence by a new creation linking the personality to its former self. This notion regards the spirit as only soul and having no existence apart from the body: forgetting the tripartite distinction of body and soul and spirit, according to which the immaterial principle in man is soul as using a corporeal organization and spirit as independent of the bodily organ. The article in the Creed " He descended into Hades " expressed the early condemnation of this hypothesis. In the third century Origen opposed the same belief as held by the THNETOPSYCHITAE. In the Middle Ages and at the Reformation the speculation was revived; and again and again condemned under the name of PSYCHOPAN-NYCHIA, or the spirit’s intermediate night The idea has exercised a strong fascination on many who, like Luther occasionally, have found it hard to believe in a continuance of consciousness without the corporeal organism; and they have sought support in the fact that the dead sleep in Jesus:1 a figurative expression which by no means favors the view. It has seemed to many that the subject is relieved of much difficulty if we assume that in the consciousness of the soul the moment of death is literally the moment of resurrection, the long interval being in that consciousness less than a moment. But both the Lord’s parable of Dives and the whole scenery of the Apocalypse present the intermediate state as a scene of life. The Apostle says that to be

absent from the body is to be present with the Lord;2 and the tenor of the New Testament runs that way. This hypothesis, however, has found and still finds many supporters in modern times 11 Thessalonians 4:14; 2 2 Corinthians 5:8

2. The basis or tendency of that theory is materialistic; but there has never been wanting a current of anti-materialist speculation, which, asserting that the resurrection is past already,1 equally annihilates the intermediate state though in a different way. Those who early represented this notion, condemned by St. Paul, held the Gnostic error that redemption wrought its final triumph in the deliverance of the spirit from its bodily prison. They supposed the dead to have already come to the spirits of just men made perfect;2 misunderstanding that perfection as the release from matter of all creaturely existence. This error, like the former, is inconsistent with the uniform doctrine of Scripture that the dead are assembled in an antechamber of eternity, a waiting-place for final decision; and that the consummation of the individual, whether for weal or woe, is that of his triple nature: death being a violent dissolution of elements never intended to be disjoined, and the resurrection being the raising of the whole man in his integrity in order to his appearance in the body of his former probation before the bar of God 1 2 Timothy 2:18; 2 Hebrews 12:23

3. The dogma of Purgatorial discipline in the great Interval has been already alluded to when the sacraments were studied. It must be noticed here in its connection with a vast system of formulated doctrine, concerning the souls of the departed, which has been erected especially by the Western Church. The older mediaeval theology taught that there were five regions: Heaven and Hell, on the extreme frontiers of Hades, if not beyond; the Limbus Infantum, where the unbaptised infants wait, without suffering but without the vision of God, for their higher beatification; the Limbus Patrum, where in the same negative state of mere poena damni the Old-Testament fathers long expected Christ’s coming and finally welcomed Him; and Purgatory, where the mass of imperfect Christians are fitted for heaven, aided in the process; whether that of literal or of spiritual fire, by the suffrages of their friends on earth. This dogmatic addition to the Faith was confirmed at the Council of Trent. But it does not profess to find its foundation in Scripture. It is true that it appeared early among the tendencies of Christian speculation

We find traces of it in Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine; it was largely developed by Gregory the Great—the last of the Fathers proper, and the first of the Pontifical Fathers— about the beginning of the seventh century; and it was laid down as dogma by the Council of Florence in 1439. But it is not the unforced teaching of any passage in the sacred Canon. And the superstitions based on it in the current Roman theology, with the abuses to which it has ministered, are its sufficient condemnation: if any other argument is needed than its too close affinity with heathenism, and the dishonor it puts on the perfect satisfaction of the Atonement, 4. Modern views of the continued application of the Redeemer’s work in the other world do not lie open to the same objections; though they also are beset with much difficulty and equal danger. They have taken a variety of forms, some having a seeming Scriptural support, others only defended by sentiment. It has already been seen in connection with the Mediatorial History of the Redeemer that His Descent into Hades was accompanied by a proclamation of His Gospel. Sound exegesis requires this; but sound theology will be careful to found no dogmatic teaching upon a revelation which is strictly limited to our Lord’s own personal assumption of the keys of Hades.1 He is declared to be the Lord of the dead;2 but it is not said of Him or of His servants that they preach to the dead

Nothing is more plainly revealed, for all who hear the Gospel, than this: Behold, now is an accepted time; behold, now is a day of salvation.3 There is no branch of theology the study of which requires more self restraint and strict submission to the Word of God 1 Revelation 1:18; 2 Romans 14:9; 3 2 Corinthians 6:2

5. There is need of avoiding opposite extremes. It is hard to conceive that the spirit which we trace only as developed in strict harmony with a bodily organism can exist in full consciousness without it; but we must hold that mystery of a resurrection before the resurrection—a resurrection of the spirit from its body —until the time of the revelation of all solvable mysteries shall come. It is equally hard to understand that the spirits of just men consummated1 with Christ are only in a state of comparative consummation, and wait for a fuller disclosure of what is to them almost as full of mystery as it is to us. Yet it is so, and we must submit to regard the intermediate state as one in which the grace of patient waiting will have her perfect work;2 the grace which pre-eminently belongs to time, and in time almost shares the supremacy of love, but cannot exist in eternity. The reaction from the dogma of purgatory has tended rather to efface the distinction between what is after all the kingdom of the dead3 and what has yet to be revealed as the kingdom of the living beyond. The extremes of assuming a perfect unchangeable fixedness of condition, on the one hand, and of assigning to Paradise the true work of probation, on the other, must be avoided. The permanent and consummated destinies of the good and the evil are associated with the day of judgment and its issues. We must not antedate those issues; nor ought we, with regard either to the saved or the lost, to think of heaven as entered or hell as opened before the crisis of which the angelic oath gives a watchword, that there shall be time no longer,4 chronos ouketi estai. Not until then may either exegesis or speculation think that the mystery of God should be finished 1 Hebrews 12:23; 2 James 1:4; 3 Romans 14:9

6. The Apocalypse shows that the disembodied spirits of the saints follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth.1 Remembering all that this phrase means in the Gospels, we conclude that they enjoy the blessed discipline of communion with Him. Moreover, we are told that having washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb,2 they still serve Him day and night in His temple; that the Lamb Which, is in the midst of the throne shall feed them;3 that, with us their fellow-servants also and their brethren,4 while they reign on the earth, they are still companions in the kingdom and patience that are in Jesus, crying: How long, 0 Lord?5 All this indicates a progress in blessedness and in the development of moral energy during the disembodied state. They have the discipline of hope; and of hope as not yet eternal in the heavens, though no longer probationary. They wait for the consummation, their Lord’s and their own. And their progress in the spiritual life is not simply that which after the judgment will go on for ever, but an advance from stage to stage peculiar to the intermediate state. Time is behind them; time is also before them; the day of eternity is not yet fully come 1 Revelation 14:4; 2 Revelation 7:14-15; Revelation 7:17; 3 Revelation 6:11; 4 Revelation 1:9; 5 Revelation 6:10

7. As to the locality and the bodily investiture of this state we know only that we know nothing. In proportion to the scantiness of revealed doctrine has been the abundance of speculation. By some it has been supposed that the spirit is naked and absolutely bodiless: an idea which our physical training on earth renders inconceivable, but which is not on that account to be rejected. Others suppose that the descriptions of the Apocalypse are not entirely figurative, but that the separated spirit will as it were create for itself, or have provided for it, an ethereal vehicle answering to the

soul once animating the body But this intermediate corporeity, this Prima Stola, which has found large acceptance among modern theologians, and early received its highest poetical expression in Dante, has no countenance in Scripture. The white robes1 of the Apocalypse are by the Apocalypse interpreted: and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.

2 The notion is inconsistent with the Scriptural idea of death, as well as with the description of the departed as pneumata or spirits;3 and it is a peculiar version of the first resurrection which unscripturally anticipates the resurrection proper. No subject has been more fantastically dealt with; but speculation is here misplaced. Suffice that all who die in the Lord are united to Him in His glorified incarnate nature; and His heavenly body is their home 1 Revelation 3:5; 2 Revelation 7:14; 3 Hebrews 12:23

8. This leads us back once more to the probabilities of the estate of the ungodly departed, already hinted at in another connection. Whatever the progress of the disembodied spirit of the saint may be from glory to glory, there is nothing in Scripture to sanction the hope of any influences in the intermediate state that shall tend to translate from their dishonor the disembodied rejecters of Christ. In the present day the word of God is most keenly scrutinized for any the faintest gleam of encouragement. But none is found upon which hope may be surely grounded. Certainly as to the despisers of the atonement no language can be more explicit than the testimony of our Lord and His Apostles. And as to those who have not deliberately rejected Him of Whom they never heard, the silence of revelation should be our silence. There is no distinct announcement as to the publication of the glad tidings of redemption in the other state to those who never heard them on earth. This, like many other secrets of that state, is kept hidden in the Divine counsel, Son, remember!1 may seem to imply that until the Day of Judgment warning counsel is given for profit; but those words were spoken to one whose condition could not be changed: There is a great gulf fixed.2 And, what is more, the definitive separation is not only ordained of God but it is also declared to rest upon an internal disability: If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.3 The Savior certainly speaks of one kind of sin which is to be forgiven neither in this world, nor in that which is to come;4 and it might appear that there is pardon to be offered at least for all other sins. But it is undeniable that the entire phrase was current in the sense of NEVER. Moreover, the words might mean that the sin against the Holy Ghost would be committed as well in the coming dispensation of the Messianic kingdom after Pentecost as in His own preliminary dispensation. Certainly no doctrine can be based on such designedly mysterious words. Undoubtedly the whole tenor of the New Testament teaches us that, as there is none other Name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved,5 all who are not saved must reject that Name in some way revealed to them. From this conclusion neither Scripture nor human charity permits us to decline. But how that light is to irradiate the dread future we know not, and it is presumptuous even for charity too curiously to inquire: this and many other mysteries must be left to the infinite love and the infinite wisdom of the Holy Trinity. Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?6 1 Luke 16:25; 2 Luke 16:26; 3 Luke 16:31; 4 Matthew 12:31; 5 Acts 4:12; 6 Genesis 18:25 THE DAY OF CHRIST: RESURRECTION AND JUDGMENT The second coming of our Lord is the one all-commanding event of prophecy and the future: itself supreme, it is always associated with the universal resurrection, the judgment of mankind, and the consummation of all things. Though these epochs and crises are in the style of prophecy presented together in foreshortened perspective, they are widely distinct. But while we

treat them as distinct, we must be careful to remember their common relation to the Day of the Lord; which is a fixed and determinate period, foreshadowed in many lesser periods to which the same term is applied, but the issue and consummation of them all THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST

Throughout the ancient economy a future period called the day of Jehovah appears as the one perspective of all prophecy. In the New Testament this day is declared to have come; all the purposes of the Divine mercy and judgment are regarded as accomplished in the advent of Christ, which is the last time or the end of the world. But the day resolves itself into days; and what Old-Testament prediction beheld as one undistinguished whole is now divided into times and seasons, which all however converge to one decisive and fixed event, the return of Jesus from the invisible world. There is a rich and steady light thrown upon the Christian day of Jehovah, which is variously described in relation to the final manifestation of the Person of Christ, and the final consummation of His work. As it regards the latter, there are some historical theories of very considerable importance which must be examined THE LAST APPEARANCE OF JESUS This event cannot be studied to advantage apart from the work of the Redeemer. But a few observations on the final manifestation of His Person will pave the way; besides being a fit tribute to the Lord Himself. The great crisis is connected with Him as His final Mission, His second Coming, and in both His Day. In this order we have a certain ascending progression, terminating in the Divine-human dignity of the Lord Whose day is always associated with His highest glory. The first expression suggests that even in heaven the Incarnate is still subordinate and will be SENT of the Father, this being the end of His mediatorial estate of humiliation. That He may send Jesus, the Christ who hath been appointed for you: Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restoration of all things.1 In harmony with this the New Testament ends with the Revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto Him.2 But in that revelation He foreannounces Himself as waiting for the hour when in His majesty He will return to the earth with no trace of His humbled estate. He will, as the glorified Divine-human Person, COME. So had He promised His disciples: I will come again.3 This same Jesus, Which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner,4 said the angels of the Ascension omitting the Again. Behold, He cometh with clouds,5 is the corresponding human testimony of the last Apostle when in prophetic vision he beheld His glory and spoke of Him. Thus it is the coming, in one sense, in another, it is the second coming, or the coming again of the Lord. Hence, also, the Scripture rises above both these phrases, and speaks of that future event as His Day,6 or that day,7 or the day of Jesus Christ,8 which is in the new economy all that the day of Jehovah was in the old. The day of the Lord9 is the horizon of the entire New Testament: the period of His most decisive manifestation in a glorious revelation of Himself which could not be, and is never, predicated of any but a Divine Person. And this may be regarded as the most emphatic word used concerning the great Future

1 Acts 3:20-21; 2 Revelation 1:1; 3 John 14:3; 4 Acts 1:11; 5 Revelation 1:7; 6 Luke 17:24; 7 2 Timothy 1:18; 8 Php 1:6; 9 1 Thessalonians 5:2 THE CONSUMMATION OF HIS WORK The Second Coming of our Lord is His final and definitive appearance for the consummation of all things pertaining to His work of redemption 1. The terms used to describe it are such as refer both to His Person and to His office

They must be taken in their combination as including both. The most prominent is Parousia, indicating that when He comes He will always be present: the time of His absence shall have

passed for ever. It may not mean the blessed paradox that present always by His Spirit He will then be always present in person: but the word simply signifies His Presence, which will then be so different from what it is now that the change from one to the other is no less than a coming again. Hence it is apokalupsis, the disclosure or manifestation of Himself from heaven which has received Him. It is the epufaneia, His manifestation in a glory which His people will share: When Christ, Who is our life, shall appear,1 or be made manifest, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory At His first coming, when He became incarnate, the saving grace appeared, epefanee, and we still look for the glorious appearing of the Great God and our Savior.2 These several terms must be united. They are found all together in one classical passage. When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, en tee apokalupsei tou Kuriou Leesou, that Wicked, also to be revealed,3 He shall destroy with the brightness of His coming,4 tee epifaneia tees parousias autou. Thus it follows from the combination of all, that, while He is always present by His Spirit, He will yet be revealed from the other world, from whence also we look for the Savior;5 and His glorious power and perfections will attend Him for the rejoicing of His saints, and the confusion of His foes 1 Colossians 3:4; 2 Titus 2:11-13; 3 2 Thessalonians 1:7; 4 2 Thessalonians 2:8; 5 Php 3:20

2. It is very important to note that this great event is always connected with a complete end and consummation of that work which the Lord began in His first appearance: which, indeed, had been commenced with the beginning of human history, but still more truly commenced in the fullness of time. With regard to His atonement, it is said that He will appear a second time without sin unto salvation:1 that is, without any redeeming relation to the sin which He will still find, and for the complete and bodily salvation of those whom He has already saved in spirit. This is a cardinal text, and the variation in the phraseology, chosen with great precision, must be observed. In this verse the word is oftheesetai, while in another which says that He appeared to put away sin2 it was pefanerootai: His manifestation between these two, now to appear in the presence of God for us, is emfanistheenai, The first is the most visible exhibition of Himself as King, in the judicial form of His kingly office. He vindicates His atonement as against all who have despised it. Sin will be finally punished as the rejection of Himself and His redemption. The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with His mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ:3 upon all hearers of that Gospel who shall then be found without Evangelical knowledge of God: of which more hereafter 1 Hebrews 9:28; 2 Hebrews 9:24; Hebrews 9:26; Hebrews 9:28; 3 2 Thessalonians 1:7

3. Hence the Parousia is the object of expectation only to the Church as such, as a collation of the passages in which it is used will prove. The word literally means the Lord’s PRESENCE with His people for ever, and the tabernacle of God is with men1 in St John. It is applied in Scripture, and in current theology, to the beginning of that presence by a common metonomy; the Coming being made to stand for what follows the coming The individual Christian has his share in the hope; but not as expecting necessarily to see it. To him the night cometh when no man can work.2 As to the corporate body the night is far spent, the day is at hand.3 The Church never dies nor thinks of death, though she buries her dead. But throughout the New Testament the two prospects are always in view, and referred to in the same style. As the individual must remember that death is at hand, though with every probability of surviving many years, so the Church must remember the coming of the Lord, though it may probably be ages in the distance 1 Revelation 21:3; 2 John 9:4;

3 Romans 13:12 THE TIME OF THE LORD'S APPEARING The period of the Second Coming is perpetually referred to in the New Testament; but in such a way as to demand the utmost caution in the interpreter. The historical review of the question will bring it again into consideration; meanwhile the following hints are of importance

1. It is evident that the Day of the Lord is one definite season or karios, preceded by times or chronos. But it is evident also that the several terms are applied to other events which foreshadow its coming. The whole space of the Christian dispensation is described as these last days1 of which it is said that the darkness is past, and the True Light now shineth.2 It is this of which the Lord said, Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day: and he saw it, and was glad.3 He also spoke of events anterior to the final consummation as His coming. For instance, when He declared, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in His kingdom.4 He referred to the destruction of the Jewish polity, and to the Pentecostal glory of His kingdom assumed in the Ascension, To that great event, immediately impending over the generation to which the Lord was a Prophet, may be referred many of the predictions which are sometimes referred to the final catastrophe. Moreover, it is undoubted that every special intervention for judgment, whether in the case of a church or even of an individual, is spoken of as a coming of the Lord. It is, indeed, sometimes very difficult to decide when the prophecy leaves behind all lesser accomplishments and points to the supreme consummation. But, allowing all this, there is a constant and clear allusion to one definite day which marks the second coming, or the return of Jesus to the earth which He has left 1 Hebrews 1:1; 2 1 John 2:8; 3 John 8:56; 4 Matthew 16:28

2. Again, it is obvious that the Supreme Prophet of His own dispensation has made it a law of His kingdom that its final consummation shall for ever be uncertain as to its date

Even after His resurrection He said: It is not for you to know the times and the seasons, which the Father hath put in, His own power.1 During His humbled estate He condescended to be a partaker in His human faculties of that ignorance: But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven neither the Son, but the Father.2 Hence in His eschatological discourses He answered the disciples' double question, Tell us, when shall these things be?3 in such a manner as to prevent their attempting to define either the date of the nearer end of the world, the destruction of Judaism, or that of the more distant end of all things. He gave, after the manner of ancient prophecy, an answer that embraced all the future in one sublime series of predictions: giving the prominence to that more immediate catastrophe which concerned the present generation; so much so that He did not hesitate to say: Verily, I say unto you. This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled.4 The final consummation, however, was present to His thoughts, and nothing short of it, when He added, Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My words shall not pass away. In His eschatological revelations in the Apocalypse the order is inverted. First, it is said, Behold, He cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see Him, and they also which pierced Him; and all the tribes of the earth shall mourn over Him;5 and then follows a series of subordinate comings before the end, Behold I come quickly,6 which returns to the beginning again This is one key to all the eschatological notes of the New Testament. St. Peter, speaking of the great event, says, One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day,7 in order to suppress the spirit of restless impatience. Nor is there a single passage in all the Apostolical writings which lends any help to an exact chronological

determination 1Acts 1:7; 2Mark 13:32; 3Matthew 24:3; 4Matthew 24:34-35; 5Revelation 1:7; 6Revelation 22:12; 72 Peter 3:8

3. In harmony with this truth, it must also be maintained that the New Testament gives some hints of an historical development in its eschatology. There are some events which are predicted as to take place before the return of Jesus

(1.) Our Lord Himself has given one clear note. And this Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come.1 He does not say that all nations will receive it, though St. Paul prophesies that the fullness of the Gentiles,2 to pleeroma ton ethnon, will enter into Christendom, by a general conversion which leaves the question of the personal conversion of all individuals untouched. Of course, it is understood that these nations are literally the entire congregation of the tribes of heathenism scattered over the whole earth. Let this be connected with the commission given to the Christian company as represented by the Apostles; and it will be manifest that the times of the Gentiles3 stretch over the whole stadium of the present missionary work of Christendom. The final and proper coming of the Lord cannot take place until the whole world has been, in the New-Testament sense of the word, evangelized. The Lord will never again preach His own Gospel in person, though He will be always with those who preach it unto the end of the world.4 1 Matthew 24:14; 2 Romans 11:25; 3 Luke 21:24; 4 Matthew 28:20

(2.) The calling of the Gentiles implied, in a sense, the diminishing of Israel's prerogative; but if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but life from the dead?1 The conversion of Israel is to follow the ingathering of the heathen, and issue in a virtual resurrection of Christendom. The whole tenor of Scripture points to a restoration of the Jewish nation through its acceptance of the Messiah; and that as taking place before the final return. St. Paul here also is the interpreter of prophecy, as well as a prophet himself. At the close of the Epistle to the Romans he gives its rightful prominence to the revelation of the MYSTERY which was now at length made known to all nations for the obedience of faith;2 but on his way to the close he had alluded to the same secret of heaven as affecting the Jews. I would not9 brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this MYSTERY, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that hardening in part is happened to Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in.3 The hardness of heart that has fallen upon the rejecters of Jesus is to continue— not through any determinate counsel of God, but in the order of their own probationary course; as the same Apostle preached, Seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles4—until the great mass of the heathen nations is at least nominally converted. But their hour will come. As touching the election, they are beloved for the fathers' sake.5 The descendants of Abraham must, sooner or later, enjoy the fulfillment of a thousand promises, and enjoy them as a people; for the gifts and calling of God are without repentance.6 There will be to them times of refreshing7 prepared for by penitent faith. But this involves no restoration to their own land; nor any distinction between them and the rest of mankind: the calling and gifts of the Gentiles also are not repented of; they also may say We are the circumcision;8 and the children of the promise are counted for the seed.9 The middle wall of partition is broken down10 for ever. And all the predictions of the Gospel which introduce the entire scenery of the Law and the Temple are to be understood as figurative representations of the Christian Church

1Romans 11:15; 2Romans 16:24-26; 3Romans 11:25; 4Acts 13:46; 5Romans 11:28; 6Romans 11:29; 7Acts 3:19-21; 8Php 3:3; 9Romans 9:8; 10Ephesians 2:14

(3.) What this life from the dead1 may mean is part of the MYSTERY2 of the great change in the relative position of Israel and the Gentiles which will take place. It is not the literal resurrection; for the Lord has not yet come. It is doubtless the great result to the Catholic Church; and we may make it the foundation of the largest millennial hopes that ever gladdened the hearts of Christ's suffering people. There is in prospect a resurrection state of His cause in comparison of which all previous life has been death. Though the first resurrection has long begun, and multitudes of souls have heard the voice of the Son of God and lived, yet the future age has in store the more abundant life, of which we enjoy at the utmost only the firstfruits 1Romans 11:15; 2Romans 11:25

(4.) Yet the coming of the Lord will not even then be literally at hand. A great Apostasy, or a series of apostasies, governed by one spirit of Antichrist, and issuing in one mysterious development, is in the unrolled history of the Church before the Lord's Day This enemy of the Faith is described as having two characteristics: it is a political power, and a gigantic spiritual delusion, separate and combined. But these will be finally concentred in one personality, the anomos, that lawless One,1 who is sometimes called the Antichrist pre-eminently. This Antichrist, if that is his name, no man knows. Previous manifestations, as St. John teaches, have never been wanting. The Roman power or the Beast has been broken, but other forces, political and intellectual, have always been opposing, and will reach a height as yet unparalleled. Spiritual and ecclesiastical corruption in a carnal church has overshadowed Christendom for ages; but it has a career yet to be run, before it will vanish away. Prophetical theology has its many hypotheses for the explanation of the symbols of Daniel and the Apocalypse, and the plain words of St. Paul. But there has not yet been found on earth the power or the being to whom all St

Paul's terms are applicable. Before the end he will be made manifest. Of the tribulation thence resulting, when Satan, hitherto bound, is for a little season let loose, our Savior said that it will be such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be.2 For it will be the last: the longsuffering of Jesus will be exhausted. When His Church shall be oppressed to the uttermost He will suddenly appear, taking vengeance on them that know not God, but to be glorified in His saints.3 12 Thessalonians 2:8; 2Matthew 24:21; 32 Thessalonians 1:8-10

HISTORICAL On the subject of our Lord's Return, Christian speculation has from the beginning found matter of deep and inexhaustible interest. Errors have abounded; and all the more as the standard of appeal is the prophetic, and therefore the obscurer, part of Scripture. The history of opinion may be traced with ease so far as concerns the leading idea—that of the Millennial Kingdom—which has been its centre. There have been no sects based solely upon opinions on this topic; but almost all Christian communions have been more or less infected by them. It will be sufficient to note the critical stages of thought in the ante-Nicene age; the aspect of the question during the Mediaeval times down to the Reformation; and its development in more modern theology

1. But first it must be observed that the New Testament itself contains the germs of all subsequent speculation on this subject. Beginning with the Apostles, we find the restless spirit of inquiry as to the future dates of the Divine dispensations at once repressed by our Lord: in an interdict which was never afterwards removed. He who well weighs the words of Jesus will never feel any

disposition to calculate the times and the seasons: not even when the Apocalypse earnestly enjoins their study generally. The Thessalonians were disposed to err on this subject; and the Apostle simply declares that the coming of the Lord must not be regarded as instantly impending: he does in fact intimate that all thought on this subject must take account of intermediate events. The visions of the Apocalypse described, for the then present community, scenes which were shortly to come to pass, for the encouragement of the suffering Church; but those who first read them were not taught precisely when to expect the downfall of the persecuting emperor, and the events that followed. And, on the whole, the tone of New-Testament teaching regards the Day of the Lord, His coming and His eternal reign, as at hand always. Neither the Apostles nor the Churches knew when He would come. Nor can we without presumption suppose that any study of the prophecies will give us a knowledge denied to them

2. There was an early CHILIASM, or MILLENARIANISM—the Greek and Latin forms respectively of the thousand years of our Lord's supposed reign on earth—which was predominant in early times especially among the Jewish or Judaising Christians: part of the residue of their carnal Messianic expectation so tenaciously held. In the second century this doctrine was largely held by orthodox Christians, and was adopted by the heretical Montanists. It was undoubtedly the faith of some of the Fathers, such as Papias, Justin, Irenaeus, Cyprian, Tertullian, and Lactantius; but by no means at any time the faith of the Church, as is proved by its absence from all the early Creeds. It may be said, further, that as a general belief Chiliasm vanished from Christendom with the fourth century. It was resolutely opposed by those—such as Caius of Rome and Dionysius of Alexandria—who denied the apostolicity of the Apocalypse, on the twentieth chapter of which the notion of a pre-millennial advent is mainly based. The Alexandrian theology, always spiritualistic and allegorical, condemned it on account of its grossly carnal conception of the earthly reign of Christ with the saints. Clement and Origen strongly argued against it in every form. With the accession of the empire, under Constantine, to Christianity the main inducement to cherish the hope of a speedy visible return of a victorious Redeemer passed away. Augustine and other teachers introduced an interpretation of the First Resurrection and the Millennial Reign which referred both to the present estate of Christianity: and this has been in subsequent times the prevalent catholic interpretation. Hence the doctrine of a pre-millennial Coming of Christ was excluded from every form of the Early Creeds, the keynote of all these being, FROM THENCE HE SHALL COME TO JUDGE THE QUICK AND THE DEAD

3. Mediaeval Chiliasm was generally the badge of fanatical and heretical sects. At the close of the tenth century Christendom was deeply disturbed by an undefined expectation that, the thousand years—dating from the first Advent—having elapsed, the end of the world would come. When that fear was suppressed the notion again deeply slumbered But after the Reformation, the Anabaptists in Germany preached a carnal reign of Christ upon earth, as the Fifth Monarchy Men in England afterwards did, and with frightful consequences to life and morals. Hence the Lutheran Symbols were emphatic in condemning it. The leading Confession conjoins in its condemnation the idea of a personal Reign and of the final restoration of all souls: "Damnant Anabaptistas, qui sentiunt hominibus damnatis ac diabolis finem poenarum futurum esse. Damnant et alios, qui spargunt Judaicos opiniones, quod ante resurrectionem mortuorum pii regnum mundi occupaturi sint, ubique oppressis impiis." Similarly the earlier English Articles, or Confession of Edward VI. The Reformed Churches were equally strenuous. The Belgic Confession assigns the date of

Christ’s Coming as that in which the number of the elect shall be complete. " Credimus Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, quando tempus a Deo praestitum, quod omnibus creaturis est ignotum, advenerit, et numerus electorum completus fuerit, e coelo rursus venturum." The Articles and Formularies of the Anglican Church are not in favor of Pre-Millenarianism. " Christ ascended into heaven, and there sitteth until He return to judge all men at the last day." It may be safely affirmed that the Confessions of the Reformation, as well as its leading divines, were opposed to the doctrine of two resurrections, and of a personal reign of Christ on earth intervening between them THE PRE-MILLENNIAL ADVENT No Church having incorporated the doctrine into its profession of faith, it has been in modern times confined to schools of thought within the several communions, influenced, for the most part, and led by individual students of prophecy. Modern hypotheses for the solution of the mystery of a double resurrection are far too numerous and far too diversified to be sketched even in outline. They spread into a great variety of schemes; almost every holder of the general idea having his own interpretation. From Mede, perhaps its earliest and ablest supporter in England, and Bengel in Germany, a century later, through a multitude of students of prophecy in nearly all religious communities, there has been an always increasing number of believers in the intermediate coming of the Lord. Widely differing on a thousand subordinate points they agree in this one, and all their speculations may be said to be variations on the theme of a Pre-Millennial Advent. This belief has, during the present century, been incorporated into many systems, being almost the leading characteristic of some. Still it is generally speaking held only by individuals and private schools of interpretation: inconsistently by divines of the Lutheran, Anglican, Westminster, and some other Confessions; consistently by those alone who in other respects deny the analogy of the faith as expressed in the ancient creeds and the formularies of the Reformation and the general consent of the Catholic Church, being limited by no Confession

1. The main foundation of the system is the Apocalyptic passage which is thought to predict the binding of Satan a thousand years, the first resurrection of martyrs and other elect saints who reign with Christ upon earth, the subsequent loosing of Satan for a season, a final apostasy, and the coming of the Redeemer to vindicate Himself and His Church.1 Now we have seen that our Lord expressly speaks in one and the same discourse of a first resurrection, understood spiritually, and of a second resurrection understood physically.2 If we apply the same principle here, this much contested symbolical prophecy is made perfectly harmonious with the rest of Scripture, and the most substantial ground of the pre-millennial advent is taken away 1Revelation 20:1-9; 2John 5:28-29

2. Those who understand both resurrections literally build so many and such contradictory systems on this passage that it is impossible to reach any consistent dogmatic result. Some, like Mede, admit a glorious presence of Christ, but not a personal visible reign. Others think, following Bengel, that there will be two periods of a thousand years. Some again hold that the reign of Christ will be visible, at Jerusalem, and in the midst of His risen and glorified saints; that the Temple at Jerusalem will be rebuilt, the ancient sacrifices restored, though only as commemorative; and that the end of the Christian economy, as it precedes the final consummation, will be little other than another glorified Jewish dispensation. Rejecting this, many think that the Lord will reign from heaven amidst His risen saints: He and they alike being only occasionally visible, after the analogy of the Forty Days’ Interval between the visible and the invisible Christ before the Ascension. A still more moderate class allow that there are certain events in the program of prophecy which must

previously take place, and patiently wait for them; though the endeavor to insert these events before the Return really undermines their doctrine. Baffled in this endeavor, the majority are content to live in daily expectation of a Savior, Whose coming will vanquish all opposition, and begin a new, better, more effectual, and more glorious dispensation of the Gospel: though this requires them to suppose that the residuary processes of the mediatorial work will be miraculously condensed or foreshortened in a way for which the Scriptures allow no encouragement

Finally, in despair of any other solution, not a few blend all theories into one indiscriminate confusion, and profess to believe that the return of Jesus will accomplish all prophecies in a manner of which no theory ever devised gives a hint: that He will carry on a judgment for an indefinite period, and gradually glorify the earth into a meet residence for a generation of the holy which will be propagated, as some of them think, throughout eternity

3. The inconsistency of this hypothesis with the Scriptural representations of the work of Christ is its sufficient refutation. There is but one visible appearance of Christ set before the expectation of His people. We have seen the several terms which describe this appearance; but it is observable that one, not yet mentioned, is reserved by St. John for his final document. He speaks of the Lord's manifestation to take away our sins,1 efaneroothee; he speaks of only one other manifestation: when He shall appear,2 ean faneroothee. Here is the clear and sufficient final testimony of the Bible. Again, the testimony of Jesus declares that the coining of the Lord will bring deliverance to the laboring Church: lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh.3 This is inconsistent with such a Millennium as modern theories paint; in it the earth is transformed as the scene of a reign in which only an election of the saints are concerned; in which, moreover, the redemption from sin and from sorrow has not taken place: not till afterwards there shall be no more death, neither sorrow.4 And the notion of such a personal reign after His glorious coming is encumbered with hopeless difficulties. A church, made perfect in spirit and body, glorified with the Glorified Christ, in the midst of a world still in sin and death, cannot be reconciled with sober interpretation of Scripture. A rebellion of the world against such a rule would be a thing incredible: the lapse of such a Christendom would be death from life, a second and profounder FALL OF MAN. But yet such a lapse must be assumed on this theory. Again, where would be place for the judgment, awaiting all alike? There must be another resurrection of those, who, during the Millennium, had been converted, and a second coming of the Lord to raise them, and to conduct the more general judgment. Finally, the intercession of Christ is represented as continuing ever, even as His spiritual presence in His missionary Church endures to the end of the world; but both of these are inconsistent with the Millennial hypothesis in any form which subtlety may give it 11John 3:5; 21 John 2:28; 3Luke 21:28; 4Revelation 21:4

4. It cannot be denied that there are many difficulties in any view of the subject, and in ours. There are wide differences of opinion among expositors who hold fast the general principle that there is only one Second Coming answering to the First. Some suppose, with Hengstenberg, that the Millennium dates from the establishment of the Germanic Empire, about 800 A.D., and that it is now behind us, with the end close approaching

Others, and they are the majority, assume that the thousand years indefinitely describe a future triumphant state of the Church that will be followed by a temporary lapse, after which the Lord will suddenly appear for the destruction of the yet unrevealed leader of the final opposition. Others fall

back upon the interpretation which may be called the catholic one, since it ruled the mind of the Church from the time of Augustine. It is content to understand figuratively the glowing representations of the ancient prophecies as applying to the present Christian Church. It takes the Apocalypse as a book of symbols, which does not give consecutive history, but continually reverts to the beginning, and exhibits in varying visions the same one great final truth. Satan was bound or cast out,1 when the Savior ascended: he has never since been the god and seducer of the nations as he was before, and as he will for a season be permitted to be again. The saints, martyrs, and others—the martyrs pre-eminently—now rule with Christ: and hath made us a kingdom!2 they themselves sing; and they reign upon earth.3 The Apostles, and all saints, have part in the first resurrection,4 and in the present Regeneration reign with Jesus, though the future Regeneration shall be yet more abundant The unanimous strain of prophecy concerning the glory of the Messiah's kingdom is to be interpreted as partly fulfilled in the spiritual reign of Christ in this world which is not yet fully manifested as it will be; and partly as the earthly figure of a heavenly reality hereafter

There can be little doubt that the principle is correct which makes this great vision a recapitulation of the whole contest of our Lord with Satan: the strongMan 1:5 who was bound6 by the Stronger than he. The Angel is He Who was manifested that He might destroy the works of the devil,7 and Who gave His people the pledge of victory over all the power of the enemy.8

1John 12:31; 2Revelation 1:6; 3Revelation 5:10; 4Revelation 20:6; 5Luke 11:21-22; 6Matthew 12:29; 71 John 3:8; 8Luke 10:19 THE RESURRECTION The resurrection of the dead, as the immediate effect of our Lord's coming, will be the first or preliminary act of the consummation of His redeeming work. It will be to the entire family of Adam the restoration of their bodies to the spirits from which death had severed them; but it is the specific rising again of the saints in union with their Head of which the New Testament especially speaks. The prominent notion given us is that man recovers his entireness; his flesh being adapted to a new sphere, and resumed in order to its final glorification CHRIST AND THE RESURRECTION In its relation to the Redeemer the resurrection is of essential, fundamental, and universal importance. It gives Him one of His pre-eminent names: I AM THE RESURRECTION.1 And there is no function of His Messianic office which is more habitually and more exclusively referred to Himself! As the Prophet He first revealed it fully, not as a new doctrine bat as one that had been in obscurity; as the Priest He procured it by His atonement, which was the ransom of the whole nature of man; and the word of His authority as King will effect it. Without following this specific arrangement we may with advantage trace through the New Testament the connection between the Saviour's work and the resurrection of all men

1John 11:25

I. Our Lord has confirmed and perfected the imperfect revelation of the Old Testament: this was part of that life and immortality on which He shed His light

1. He expressly declares that the resurrection was everywhere in the old economy presupposed. The rebuke of the Sadducees was very explicit. But that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the Bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.1 As the children of God, so called in the Saviour's new terminology, are the children of the resurrection, so the ancient fathers were, and are, and will ever be His in their integrity: His now in

their spirit, hereafter in spirit and body. The key thus put into our hands by the Master His Apostles have instructed us to use freely. Concerning Abraham we hear again that he offered up Isaac, accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure:2 this FIGURE of the future resurrection of Jesus and of the general resurrection in other forms runs through the Old Testament. It was with this confidence that the patriarchs desired a better country, that is, an heavenly,3 not without allusion to which Joseph gave commandment concerning his bones.4 The Psalms often rise to the hope of a redemption from Hades, generally, and in such language as implies a restoration of all that death shall consume in the grave: but God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave,5 the object of the redemption being the psychical soul, animating a body, as well as the spiritual soul kept in prison. And to that hope God responds in Hosea: I will ransom them from the power of the grave,6 where there is the remarkable addition that a figurative is based upon a literal truth. The same may be said of many passages which refer in the like figurative way to the resurrection; such as the wonderful prophecy, Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise,7 and the vision of the dry bones in Ezekiel The translation of Enoch and Elijah shed more or less brightness on all the conceptions of subsequent ages. It may be said generally that the literal restoration of the body was but dimly alluded to, and that with special reference to the saints. In Daniel, however, the literal resurrection is proclaimed, strictly as universal, and as linked with judgment: And many of them that deep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.8 In this, as in some other points of revelation, the prophecy of Daniel seems to take a large step towards the New Testament: this is specially observable in the combination of resurrection and judgment

1Luke 20:37; Luke 20:36; 2Hebrews 11:19; 3Hebrews 11:16; 4Hebrews 11:22; 5Psalms 49:14-15; 6Hosea 13:14; 7Isaiah 26:19; 8Daniel 12:2

2. But St. Paul speaks of the appearing of our Savior Jesus Christ, Who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel.1 Though the distinction between Pharisees and Sadducees proves that the resurrection was accepted and believed by many, and our Lord appeals to Martha’s latent faith in it, yet He always speaks, as His disciples do, of the resurrection as a truth which only in the Gospel is fully announced and confirmed. The proclamation of the glad tidings counteracts death in all its manifestations. Taking up that last prediction of Daniel the lifegiving Redeemer sums up His great gift as consummated in two stages. After having said that the believer is passed from death unto life He speaks of the hour that cometh, and NOW is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live; and then He speaks of the hour that is coming— and not now is—in the which all that are in the tombs shall hear His voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of judgment.2 The fuller revelation of immortality and eternal life includes, therefore, the foreannouncement of a resurrection of the whole man, and of the whole race of man, to an endless existence

When, accordingly, we hear the Savior uniting the life of His own people with their resurrection—that everyone which seeth the Son, and believeth on Him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day3—we must remember that this limitation, like that of St. Paul and St. John afterwards, presupposes the background of that earlier passage 12 Timothy 1:10; 2John 5:24-29; 3John 6:40

II. As to the relation of the Redeemer's person and work to this event, the testimony of the New Testament is fall and explicit: the Lord's own words here leading the way

1. He calls Himself and is called generally the Life;1 and this largest name is on one solemn occasion limited to the bodily resurrection, with the sublime Egoo eimi appended: I AM THE RESURRECTION AND THE LIFE.2 The Redeemer's testimony here is the grandest and most comprehensive we have on the subject: the I AM includes a source of life and power deeper than the mediatorial: For, as the Father hath life in Himself; so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself.3 But the order of the words indicates that life, as it concerns us, is bound up with the resurrection. Man is appointed to pass through a rising again, in order to final and unchangeable life: he must know the power of a first resurrection for the soul, and a second for the body. Both these are described in the words that follow, presenting the Lord's relation to us. Here, however, we have to do with the body. And the importance of its resurrection the Savior exhibits by the fact of His progressive miracles in the three acts of recalling life: to show that the Son of Man had power on earth, as to forgive sins, so also to raise the dead, He restored the spirit of the daughter of Jairus, which had scarcely left the body; He arrested Death on the way to the sepulcher with his prey, in the miracle at Nain: and He made him give up Lazarus after some days in the grave 1John 14:6; 2John 11:25-26; 3John 5:26

2. But it is difficult here to separate the Person from the work The universal resurrection is, like everything in the process of human development, the fruit of the Atonement; though this is not clearly stated, save in connection with the universal judgment, it necessarily flows from the mediation of the God-man. Because He is the Son ofMan 1:1 He hath authority both to raise and to judge all men. This will be the last function of the mediatorial lordship: requiring Divine power in the hands of a Man. I; will be like the Lord's own resurrection, the sum and consummation of all miracle: rather as it were a second creation, the formation of ALL human bodies out of the dust as at first Adam was formed, but in a resurrection which shall preserve their identity for ever. The new creation shall be a reconstruction also

1John 5:27

III. With special reference to His people, the risen Lord is the Pledge and the Pattern and the Source of their resurrection life

1. He is Himself, as the PLEDGE, called the Firstfruits of them that slept,1 and the Firstbegotten of the dead:2 in this sense also the Prototokos besides being such as the Son before every creature,3 and as the Incarnate brought into the world.4 In no relation more emphatically than in this He and His saved people are one: the resurrection is of the righteous and unto life; it is efanastasis. When St. Paul uses this term, he indicates that those who rise not to eternal glory remain, as it were, dead, or rise only to die again Their resurrection is only to the second death.5 As there is a better resurrection,6 in comparison of the resurrection back to the present life, so there is also a better or a true resurrection in comparison of the resurrection of judgment.7 And of that specific rising from the dead Christ is the pledge

11 Corinthians 15:20; 2Revelation 1:5; 3Colossians 1:15; 4Hebrews 1:6; 5Revelation 20:6; Revelation 20:14; 6Hebrews 11:35; 7John 5:29

2. The glorified body of the Redeemer is the PATTERN after which the bodies of His saints will be raised. Speaking of our spiritual conversation in heaven, with which, therefore, the body has nothing to do, the Apostle says: From whence also we look for a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ; Who shall fashion anew the body of our lowliness, conformed to the body of His glory.1 There are two words here of great importance: the summorfon suggests the same idea as that above in conformable unto His death:2 the body is to be subject to the blessed law of our predestination to be conformed to the image of HisSong of Solomon 3:1-11 This word CHANGE is not the same as in the Corinthian chapter; here it is metascheematísei, which refers only to the new fashion of the risen body; there it is allageesometha we shall all be changed,4 which refers to the entire transformation of the already existing bodies. Now it is of this latter only that our Savior was the pattern. He saw no corruption;5 and consequently could not be a perfect example at all points of our restoration from death, any more than He is the pattern at all points of our redemption from the final penalty of sin. There is an analogy here with His example of holiness: He leads not the way in the process of attainment; but is the consummate exemplar only of what we are to attain. We shall live in glorified bodies like His; but in our redemption from the dust He has no part with us 1Php. 3:23,24; 2Php 3:10; 3Romans 8:29; 41 Corinthians 15:51; 5Acts 13:37

3. And the risen Jesus is the SOURCE of that life, as the common life of man in body and soul. Union with Him is the ground and condition and secret of the resurrection of believers. It may not be possible to establish that here lies the secret of the emphasis kid upon the efanastasis, the resurrection within the resurrection. But it is certain that the passages which dwell most copiously upon this event refer only to the rising of the saints

If Christ is in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by (rather, on account of) His Spirit that dwelleth in you.1 Hence, the great resurrection-chapter is, as it were, an expansion of the Lord’s own word, Because I live, ye shall live also.2 1Romans 8:10-11; 2John 14:19 THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY The Object of the resurrection, as the active exertion of the Divine-human power, is the Body. But this formula must be understood in a wide latitude of meaning. It must include the perfect or undivided integrity of the Man raised up; the actual sameness or unity of the body as the organ of the spirit; and the change that adapts it to its new state when raised. Hence three terms are the watchwords of our doctrine: the Integrity, the Identity, the Glorification of the flesh raised in the last day

I. The main, or at least the most important, teaching of Scripture is that of the return of the whole man to existence: to existence, that is, in the integrity of the nature which in the idea of the Creator was that of a spiritual being using a bodily organization. Man suffers in death the penalty of a dissolution which will then be repaired. He is perfect only as spirit, soul and body. Of physical death it is said, then shall the dust return to the earth as it was;1 the psychical soul, the spirit as using material organization, in that sense of necessity vanishes with it. The spirit shall return unto God who gave it: not into His essence, but into His keeping; for final issues which it was not given the ancient Preacher to know. Behold, all souls are Mine,2 Jehovah said once, in vindication of His righteousness as determining the destiny of every individual of the race involved in hereditary guilt: and we hear, again and again, the same vindication with reference to their bodies. The man in his entireness is the man before his Maker, both now and hereafter. Hence the resurrection is the goal

of all redeeming acts. We have, says the Apostle, the firstfruits of the Spirit;3 but that is not the realization of all our hope; we still groan within ourselves. The resurrection is the finished redemption of the man; waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.4 We now groan, being burdened, for rest: we shall after death groan, being unclothed, to be clothed upon.5 Everywhere throughout Scripture it is the person who is said to rise again. No criticism can rob us of Job's ancient testimony: Though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God.6 The fathers died and were gathered each to his people. Though all live unto Him,7 God waits for their resurrection that He may fully appear to be the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob.8 As He is not ashamed to be called their God; for He hath prepared for them a city,9 so will He not be ashamed of them as its inhabitants. Speaking of that city in which we have our politeuma, our citizenship, St Paul says, He shall change our lowly body that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body.10 We are enrolled in our present integrity, and in that shall we take possession. This general view of the resurrection is of great importance

1Ecclesiastes 12:7; 2Ezekiel 18:4; 3Romans 8:23; 4Romans 8:23; 52 Corinthians 5:2-4; 6Job 19:26; 7Luke 20:38; 8Genesis 25:8; 9Hebrews 11:16; 10Php 3:16

II. The specific resurrection is of the flesh; and the express revelation of Scripture is, that the same bodies shall rise from the graves. But the identity of the body is not the identity of the man: nor is the identity of the body dependent upon the continuation of the particles in their union which were deposited in the grave. A brief reference to Scripture examples and testimonies is sufficient to obviate misconception on this subject

1. If appeal is made to our Lord's resurrection body, it must be remembered that there is no analogy. We have seen that death never finished its work of dissolution on Him: His bodily organization was inviolate. The only permissible argument is that, as His glorification took place upon a physical frame, so also will ours. But it is not said that we shall be raised as He was, in order to be afterwards glorified: it is raised a spiritual body;1 raised immediately as such. Nor have other instances of resurrection to which allusion is sometimes made any bearing on the question of identity. Some few were restored to earthly life by our Savior Himself, which, however, are not spoken of as patterns or illustrations of the general resurrection; nor do we know even that Lazarus— save in Martha's supposition—was permitted to decay. The same Lazarus was certainly restored 11 Corinthians 15:44

2. The only express reference to the subject is in St. Paul's resurrection chapter. The Apostle rebukes the folly of the doubter; and uses the argument of analogy, not to solve what he leaves a mystery, but to obviate objection. The present world furnishes abundant analogies but no resemblances of the future resurrection. Nothing in the buried flesh germinates as the life in a seedcorn: the new life is a direct creation. God giveth it a body even as it pleased Him.1 He does not mean that the disembodied spirit will form for itself a new vehicle; but that in the resurrection the spirit will have a spiritual-psychical organism given to it, which, in the wonder of Divine power, will be to it the same organ it had in time. The literal return of the dissolved body he never affirms 11 Corinthians 15:38 III. The change wrought will fit the body for new conditions of spiritual and psychical existence

1. There will be new heavens and a new earth,1 to which the new inhabitants will be fitted. The children of the resurrection2 will be isángeloi, they neither marry nor are given in marriage;3 and,

as reproduction will cease, so also nutrition, God shall destroy both it and them:4 hee koilía toís broómasin. Though the relations of sex will not be entirely destroyed—for that would destroy individuality —they will be glorified. The soul will be so renewed as to be a new creation, and the body will be more than a mere restoration: a new creation also. A strictly, carnal resurrection was part of a system of Judaizing error which affected expectations connected with the second coming of Christ, even as it had perverted the doctrine of His first coming and His relation to the law. St Paul contends against that. But a still higher view is given by him when he is not opposing heresy: Who shall change our vile body5—the body of our humiliation—that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body, according to the working whereby He is able even to subdue all things unto Himself.6 What that glorious body is to be, the last revelation of Jesus to St. John in Patmos tells us: but that only dazzles our imagination while it enkindles our hope. Those who never see physical death will be changed.7 This is a very strong word, and illustrates that glowing series of counterparts which St. Paul dilates upon: corruption and incorruption; dishonor and glory; weakness and power; a natural body and a spiritual body, all consummated in this mortal, having put on immortality.8

1Revelation 21:1; 2Luke 20:36; 3Matthew 22:30; 41 Corinthians 6:13; 5Php 3:21; 6Revelation 1:13-16; 71 Corinthians 15:51; 81 Corinthians 15:42; 1 Corinthians 15:44; 1 Corinthians 15:53

2. There is one express prophetic passage, which a few incidental allusions are thought to confirm, seeming to predict a first resurrection of martyrs and saints before the Millennial appearance and reign of the Lord. The prophet being supposed to signify a literal resurrection, St. Paul is further supposed to have referred to this when he said: Christ the Firstfruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at His coming; then cometh the end.1 But everything is here kept out of view save the order of relation between the resurrection of the Head and that of His members. There is no distinction or interval hinted at between their rising and the rising of all men. Again, St. Paul is thought to have alluded to this when he spoke of his hoping to attain unto the resurrection of the dead,2 teén exanástasin teén ek nekroón. Even if teen ek is admitted into the reading, this is no argument that the Apostle aspired to the distinction of sharing in a first resurrection before the rest of the dead.3 Exanastasis and anastasis are, as may be seen, used interchangeably. And the sequel of the chapter already quoted proves that St. Paul, like the other writers of the New Testament, knows no resurrection which is into the physical conditions of this life. There is no passage that can be made without pressure to serve the theory of a twofold resurrection: that in the symbolical vision of the Apocalypse being excepted. As to this doubtful text more is said on the doctrine of the Millennium.4 It is enough now to affirm that such a principle of interpretation must be applied as shall bring it into conformity with the universal strain of the New Testament, which speaks of one common resurrection to one common judgment. And that principle is a spiritual sense put upon the first resurrection in that passage 11 Corinthians 15:23-24; 2Php 3:11; 31 Corinthians 15:44; 4Revelation 20:5

HISTORICAL

1. The resurrection is pre-eminently a doctrine of Christianity. The germs of it, as of all other truths, are found in the Old Testament; but its full development, as one branch of the life and immortality brought to light by Jesus Christ, was reserved for the final Revealer. In the New Testament its development begins afresh. Before His own resurrection our Lord announced it generally as a

truth, partly in connection with His ultimate judicial office, and partly as a protest against error; but the Apostles, and especially St. Paul, have given us the full positive basis of our expectation. And, in the form stamped upon it by them, it is a doctrine new to the world, of which ancient Hindu Zoroastrian, Egyptian, and other speculations scarcely gave a hint. It is as a doctrine, whether of Anthropology or of Eschatology, a new and distinctive Christian revelation

2. Every recension of the Apostles' Creed contained this article: chiefly eis sarkos anastasin, sometimes anastasin nekron. The early Fathers discussed the subject with great fullness, either in pure exposition or in opposition to the Greeks, who denied, and the Gnostics, who refined away, this truth. The Gnostic sects, in their abhorrence of matter, and misinterpreting the first spiritual resurrection, affirmed that the resurrection is past already.1 The Alexandrian school, with Origen at their head, laid stress on the spiritual body2 of St. Paul; and upon the difference between nekron and sarkos as connected with anastasis: their Christian philosophy was infected by Platonism, which in some cases, though not in this, elevated their conceptions. But they were opposed by a very literal theory, which went to the opposite extreme: Irenaeus and Tertullian accepted a first resurrection, after the analogy of the Lord's body during the Forty Days, to be followed by a final and fuller spiritualization. These two opposite views—the spiritual and the carnal—alternated, until Augustine struck out a middle course: Erit spiritui subdita caro spiritualis, sed tamen caro, non spiritus; sicut carni subditus fuit spiritus ipse carnalis, sed tamen spiritus, non caro. He, moreover, thought that all would rise at the age of thirty years, the standard of perfection which Christ made the normal one. The Mediaeval Schoolmen took the two opposite sides, but mostly adhered to Augustine

Those who went to the extremes were exceedingly fanciful: some of them taught that the same bodies would rise again; the same, even to the hair and nails, and every character of the body committed to the grave 12 Timothy 2:18; 21 Corinthians 15:44

3. The Protestant doctrine was generally faithful to the ancient Creeds: the Apostles' Credo carnis resurrectionem; the Nicene, Exspecto resurrectionem mortuorum; and the Athanasian, Ad cujus adventum omnes homines resurgere habent cum corporibus suis

Subsequent Confessions conform to these with a remarkable unanimity. The Lutheran divines very copiously dilated on this topic. They taught that the new body would be the same substance, but clothed with new qualities: differunt non ratione sub-stantiae, sed quoad qualitates et dona (corpora gloriosa, potentia, spiritualia, coelestia). Impiorum corpora sunt vasa ad ignominiam et contumeliam. Their high sacramental doctrine was thus expressed: " Our bodies were framed in Adam for immortality; by the incarnation of the Son of God they were taken into affinity with Him; in His resurrection they began to be glorified; they were washed from sin in the laver of regeneration; by faith they became members of Christ in His mystical body, the temples of the Spirit; and fed and sanctified by the body and blood of Christ unto eternal life." 4. Modern speculations are too various to be examined at length: they are, for the most part, modifications of errors held in early times. There are a few which should be mentioned, as a sound theology must oppose them. Some literalists would restore the earthly body absolutely; while others, erring on the opposite side, teach that a new spiritual body will be created without any point of union with the old, or supposing that in the restitution the human form or eidos will be retained without the human substance Not a few think that there is a germ of a higher corporeity which remains in the body dissolved, and will form

for itself in some inexplicable manner a new frame: thus in fact making the BODY the principle of resurrection. While others, like the ancient Greek fathers, teach that anima corpus suum creat, and that the SOUL will, by the miraculous power of God, form its own vehicle out of the transfigured matter around it There is a well-known hypothesis, that the Holy Spirit invests the disembodied with an ethereal vehicle which will be the nucleus of the resurrection body. But in this matter we must be content to wait: it doth not yet appear what we shall be.1 The new creation at the end will after all have some analogy with that at the first, when God created the body. Behold, I make all things new:2 a second time Let us make man.3 11 John 3:2; 2Revelation 21:5; 3Genesis 1:26 THE JUDGMENT The judgment is emphatically the final revelation of the Judge: as such the Consummation of a judicial work that has ever been going on in the world. It will be executed by Christ as God-man, in strict connection with His coming to raise the dead; and its range will be universal and individual. The principles of the judgment will be the application of sundry and just tests, which will reveal the characters of all, to be followed by a final and eternal distinction or severance. In the case of the ungodly this judgment will be condemnation in various degrees but eternal; and in the case of the godly their everlasting confirmation in glory and the rewards of heaven THE JUDGE The JUDGE is our Lord Jesus Christ in His indivisible Person as the God-man; but His Person may be regarded both as Divine and as human. The office requires both, and each, and together

1. Assuredly God is the Judge of all,1 even in the Christian dispensation. And Christ is God. None but the Creator can appoint the destiny of His creatures, and bring to His bar all subjects of His dominion; but our Lord Jesus hath power to subdue all things unto Himself.2 The Judge must of necessity be the Searcher of all hearts: in Whose hands thy breath is, and Whose are all thy ways.3 The Savior is appealed to as Thou, Lord, Which knowest the hearts of all men.4 There could be no delegation to the creature of universal judgment, even as there could be no delegation of universal and absolute miraculous power. Is there a God beside Me ?5 . . . I know not any! If the Redeemer were appointed Judge as simply man, according to the notions of some, His function would be only the visible accomplishment of the judgment and sentence of the invisible God; but that is not the style of Scripture. Our cause is altogether and only in His hands 1Hebrews 12:23; 2Php 3:21; 3Daniel 5:23; 4Acts 1:24; 5Isaiah 49:8

2 Yet in the economy of redemption the Father hath given Him authority to execute judgment also, because He is the Son ofMan 1:1 And He will judge the world in righteousness by the Man whom He hath ordained.2 In relation to no part of His office is the manhood of Christ more necessary to our failing hearts, and of no office therefore is it more expressly declared. He is not of like passions with us, but He is of like flesh and blood; He knoweth our frame; He remembereth that we are dust.3 His experience of temptation—notwithstanding His necessary sinlessness—makes Him a sympathizing High-priest and a merciful Judge, in whose Divine-human soul, now and ever, to the last extreme of what is consistent with immutable holiness and law, mercy rejoiceth against judgment.4 1John 5:27; 2Acts 17:31; 3Psalms 103:14; 4James 2:13

3. Our Lord Himself declares that the Father judgeth no man, but Hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honor theSong of Solomon 1:1-17 In other words the judgment, as the last mediatorial act, is committed by the most Holy Trinity to the Second Person as incarnate, because He is the Mediator of God and men, Jesus Christ, Man; and the exercise of that function must redound to His honor. Hence it will be the final vindication of His own dignity. He

who, at His first coming, was meek and lowly of heart,2 never speaks of His second coming but in language of the most lofty self-assertion. Here only He is the King, on the throne of His glory.3 His Divine-human majesty will receive its rights in the judgment. In that day He will Himself be DISCERNED,4 or rightly judged of, and seen as He is: then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn5 because of the dishonor done to Him by the human race. Accordingly, it will be the overthrow of His enemies, then emphatically His own foes: those Mine enemies.6 Whether it be the one enemy, or those who hold with him, the vengeance of the Lord awaits them all alike. Sin will be reduced to its essence as unbelief in Jesus, and its punishment is decreed as the act of Christ's own vindication of Himself. And it will be the final display of His saving attributes towards His saints. The most profound secrets of the Saviour's gracious will to His people can never be known till then. Ye cannot bear them now:7 words which were as applicable to the blessings of the Christian covenant as they were to its mysteries. In this sense also that day will be the day of the revelation of Christ and, lastly, our Lord will then vindicate His moral government, exercised through all ages of His mediatorial history. He Himself was the most signal instance of the anomaly that perfect goodness should be encountered by perfect wrong. He will then vindicate Himself as the Administrator of moral government from the beginning. The deep, strong argument for a final judgment is the necessity for such a final rectification. He will prove that this instinct of human nature has not been implanted in vain 1John 5:22-27; 2Matthew 11:29; 3Matthew 25:31-34; 41 Corinthians 11:29; 5Matthew 24:30; 6Luke 19:27; 7John 16:12 THE JUDGED The JUDGED are the Race of mankind, in all its generations, and specifically every individual member of the race 1. Throughout the whole economy of human things the unity of the race is maintained

Though all men will not literally undergo the penalty, it is appointed unto men once to die;1 and still more absolutely after this the judgment:2 other things, even death, are contingent; judgment like sin is certain. He cometh to judge the earth;3 which in Daniel is more fully set forth: The judgment was set, and the books were opened,4 when the Ancient of days did sit.5 In the New Testament the doctrine of eternal judgment6 has become one of the principles of the new faith. Before Him shall be gathered all nations:7 these words of the judicial Gospel are very explicit They are confirmed in the Acts, He will judge the world in righteousness;8 and in the passage which, taking it as a whole, gives perhaps the largest and most solemn, and at the same time most gracious, view of the, judgment: in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my Gospel.9 The vision presented of the vast congregation of the human race, the quick and the dead, is the most wonderful that the human mind has ever been required to conceive: no finite thought can do it justice. Among the last sayings of the Word of God on this subject there are two points to be specially noted: the congregation of the nations are the quick and the dead10 and small and great:11 many who never died shall be judged, and all our Saviour's little ones who have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression12 in any sense. The judgment, therefore, must be conceived as part of a final administration generally, of which the inquisition of iniquity and its requital will be only a part

1Hebrews 9:27; 2Psalms 96:13; 3Daniel 7:9-10; 4Hebrews 6:1-2; 5Matthew 25:32; 6Acts 17:31; 7Romans 2:16; 82 Timothy 4:1; 9Acts 10:42; 101 Peter 4:5; 11Revelation 20:12; 12Revelation 20:14

2. The individuality of the judgment is implied in all the passages already adduced; and it is the most solemn secret of man's own instinct. It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this is

judgment;1 even as He hath appointed a day2 and the Judge. The only thing absolutely both universal and individual is the judgment: not even sin and sorrow can compare with it in this. In the Old Testament, we read God will bring thee into judgment;3 and in the New, Who will render to every man according to his deeds.4 This obviates every false presumption as to judgment by class, whatever form the notion may take. A theory, never shaped into words, but which is sometimes called MULTITUDINISM, silently infects many speculations. It is hard to reconcile the infinite detail with Divine dignity; but not harder to receive a special judgment than a special providence. Moreover, there is no common conscience: the conscience of every living man is the sure pledge and earnest of an individual judgment. And it precludes the thought that believers will escape the final ordeal. For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that everyone may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad.5 Here there might be some doubt; as it is only said to receive the things. But in another passage the contrary must have been stated, if true: So then everyone of us shall give account of himself to God;6 to the Lord Christ. God must be justified at the last day, as well as now, in absolving the sinner: now, by the Atonement; then, by the form and reality of judgment, as declaring the finished result of grace, and allotting to the saints their several rewards. However, it must be observed that there is a difference put between the judgment of the good and that of the evil. Judgment must begin at the house of God7 both now and hereafter: but it will not be true hereafter that the righteous is scarcely saved. The ordeal will not be then a doubtful one; its peculiar strictness and severity are confined to the present life 1Hebrews 9:27; 2Acts 17:31; 3Ecclesiastes 11:9; 4Romans 2:6; 52 Corinthians 5:10; 6Romans 14:12; 71 Peter 4:17

3. The universality at once and the individuality of the judgment form one of the most powerful arguments that can be used in dealing with men. St. Paul’s application in the case of Felix is an instance in relation to the unconverted: And as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, Felix trembled.1 As to the believer he makes a most solemn use of it in another passage: Knowing therefore the fear of the Lord, we persuade men.2 So, again, with special rebuke to the spirit of human judgment and censoriousness: But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ.3 And here we may refer to the sublime descriptions of the scenery of the great day, which are found in both the Old Testament and the New: some literal, such as the ministry of all the holy angels,4 and especially the voice of the arch-angel and the trump of God;5 some figurative, such as the books were opened;6 but all being the translation into human language of the most tremendous realities that the mind of man can conceive. It may be said that without these adjuncts of dread the great day is scarcely ever mentioned 1Acts 24:25; 22 Corinthians 5:11; 3Romans 14:10; 4Matthew 25:31; 51 Thessalonians 4:16; 6Revelation 20:12 PRINCIPLES OF THE JUDGMENT The principles of the Judgment may be exhibited and summed up in the following five watchwords: the Test applied according to various measures of probationary privilege; the Revelation of character; the Separation of classes; the Execution of the condemning sentence; and the Confirmation or ratification of the acceptance of the saved. All these will be combined in one result. The omniscient Lord will justly apply His unerring tests THE STANDARD OF PRIVILEGE

1. The universality of the law of conscience is the first, and in one sense the most comprehensive test, as preceding or underlying all others. Faith or unbelief in Christ will be thus witnessed; though

this standard is not generally referred to in that case. But the moral consciousness of all men who have not heard the Gospel will be appealed to: accusing or else excusing in the present life according to the standard of the work of the law written in their hearts; so, says St. Paul, it will be in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my Gospel.1 Hence this test, that of the internal judge and deputy, will be the only one for a large number of mankind

Emphatically the Apostle speaks of the revelation of God, Who will render to every man, according to his deeds;2 and that with reference to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile: for there is no respect of persons with God.3 How that test will be applied to individual men and vast nations that never heard or could hear the Gospel, we must leave to God the Judge of all.4 There is no word in the Bible, we may be sure, that proclaims the perdition of the Gentiles as such. How the Only Wise God our Savior5 will reconcile this righteous judgment with the truth that there is none other Name under heaven given among men, wherein we must be saved,6 than that of Jesus is a mystery; but not an unsearchable one

St. Peter perceived that, as St. Paul taught, God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation He that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him,7 and many have been bold to suppose that a like preparation for Christ will hereafter both be accepted of Him and accept Himself. But this is beyond the limits of dogmatic theology 1Romans 2:15-16; 2Romans 2:5-6; 3Romans 2:10-11; 4Hebrews 12:23; 5Jude 1:25; 6Acts 4:12; 7Acts 10:34-35 2. The measure of revealed truth granted will be another test or standard of judgment With reference to this very subject our Lord said of the Jews, They have Moses and the prophets;1 and the Old Testament ends with its prediction of judgment thus: Remember ye the law of Moses.2 Our Lord’s own words will be the standard, specifically, to His own generation: It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee!3 More generally, this will be the test for all who have heard the Gospel: The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day.4 And the measure of religious knowledge of the Gospel imparted to peoples and individuals will, according to our Lord’s own repeated exposition of the principle of judgment, constitute a subordinate test: To whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required.5 There are varieties of light and manifestation, within Christendom itself, almost as distinct as the line which divides the best heathenism from Christianity 1Luke 16:29; 2Malachi 4:4; 3Matthew 11:24; 4John 12:48; 5Luke 12:48

3. The several tests of Faith and Works, distinctly and combined, are represented as constituting the standard applied only to Christians; but to them both these will be applied (1.) Now, in relation to the judgment and its final decision, faith and works are really one The work of faith1 is the sum and substance of the whole life. Works will be the test and faith the test; but these will be one and the same: faith the principle and works the expression of a Christian life in Christ. We are justified now not by faith and by works; but by faith without the merit of works, and with the evidence of works. So will it be at the supreme vindication of the righteousness of faith 11 Thessalonians 1:3

(2.) That the works are, throughout the New Testament, made so prominent as the judicial test has many reasons. It is the standing and most solemn rebuke of all Antinomianism. It has also reference to that final and full manifestation of the Divine righteousness, against all who might impugn it, which is made so prominent everywhere

And, finally, as will be seen hereafter, the works will be the standard by which the allotment of the various degrees of reward will be determined. Gradations will be as manifold then as now: these will not be decided by faith but by works. My reward is with Me, to give every man according as his work shall be:1 this is our Lord's last testimony on the subject 1Revelation 22:12

SELF-REVELATION

Both in the Old Testament and in the New the day of judgment is represented as the final manifestation of all secrets: of all secrets, whether as such unknown fully to man, or as known only to himself, or as designedly kept hidden by him and known only to God. The depths, whether of the Satanic or of the human spirit, are penetrated only by the Searcher of hearts. But nothing is more constantly impressed than that all secrets shall then be made manifest. Only in two applications is the term SECRETS used: to the mysteries of God's Providence on earth, and the mysteries of the human heart and life. But as to both the true meaning of the word mystery is preserved: what is hidden in the present world will be made known in the world to come

1. Hence all the judged will be in a certain sense their own judges. Our Lord lays stress upon this in the parables of the Talents and the Pounds: Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee, thou wicked servant.1 The Holy Ghost is in this life the representative of Christ's judicial function; and He makes the sinner condemn himself in the conviction of sin which is the voluntary acceptance of the justice of the sentence. We may refer also to St. Paul's memorable words: If we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged.2 This principle, applied to the Lord's Supper, is of general application: we may have boldness in the day of judgment.3 1Luke 19:22; 21 Corinthians 11:31; 31 John 4:17

2. The righteousness of the Judge will thus be vindicated: That Thou mightest be justified in Thy sayings, and mightest overcome when Thou art judged.1 The future Judge will, by the perfect correspondence between the books of His own unerring remembrance and the books of the human consciousness read in the light of that day by every man for himself, approve His own righteousness both in justice and in mercy. And the present Judge keeps this now in our remembrance: If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloke for their sin.2 1Romans 3:4; 2John 15:22

3. And thus the Redeemer will maintain His unshared glory. The last exercise of judgment will be the last exercise of mercy. Mercy glorieth against judgment.1 The revelation of the holiest saints to themselves will prove that only infinite mercy saved them: therefore the revelation of their own hearts to them also. But that revelation will not be suffered to produce shame in those who are judged: if a miracle is needed to efface this element from the memory of sin it will be wrought; for nothing may interrupt the continuity of paradise and heaven

1James 2:13

SEPARATION The idea of Separation or discrimination inheres in the Greek term krisis, and in all the disclosures of the judgment

1. It will be the final separation or sifting of the world. Judgment is even now continually and indeed decisively proceeding. The Savior said: If any man hear My words, and believe not, I judge him not.1 This must be understood as meaning that His own preeminent work was salvation; and

that final judgment was reserved for the last day

Elsewhere He said: For judgment I am come into this world, that they which see not might see; and that they which see might be made blind.2 As our Lord in His own person for a season, so now by the preaching of the Gospel the Spirit evermore, executes the offices of Judge. But no judgment in the economy of grace, and within the bounds of temporal probation, is irreversible: there is a great gulf3 between characters, but it is not fixed; but the judgment to come will4 be final, absolute, and unchangeable. Hence it is the LAST or ETERNAL JUDGMENT.5 1John 12:47; 2John 9:39; 3Luke 16:26; 4Acts 24:25; 5Hebrews 6:2

2. This separation, again, will be in two senses twofold: a broad separation between two classes; and also a discrimination within those classes themselves. As to the former, the distinction will be between the sheep and the goats;1 the wicked and the just;2 the saints and those who obey not the Gospel.3 Everywhere this division into two vast masses is maintained: acceptance or rejection of Christ being the alternative. But within these great masses the same process of sifting discrimination and decision goes on. For every man there will be a distinct judgment, succeeding or included in the former, by which his position and degree either in salvation or perdition will be determined 1Matthew 25:33; 2Matthew 13:49; 32 Thessalonians 1:8

CONDEMNATION

There can be no doubt that the term judgment is most frequently connected with condemnation: this, in fact, is the more common meaning of krisis. Judgment determining the sentence, condemnation pronouncing it, and execution administering it, are almost synonymous terms with regard to the wicked: in Scripture, as in the common language of human justice. It is katakrisis

1. This requires the strictest meaning of the term punishment. It is not a Father's chastisement the testimony speaks of: that is expressed by paideia; as when we read, in three forms of this word, of the Lord Who scourgeth every son whom He receiveth.1 Of that discipline it is said, Shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, AND LIVE? But this sentence is always unto death. There is not one hint throughout the Scriptures of a discipline to which the great day commits the rebellious that they may be purified and amended. Surely, if it had been so, no economy of reserve would have kept back the revelation 1Hebrews 12:6; Hebrews 12:9

2. As to the nature of the condemnation it is, negatively, loss, or the poena damni or damnation: the quality and essence of sin being separation from God, and its direct penalty separation from the soul's life and centre and rest. Sin is no other than the severance of the will from the Divine will. Our merciful Lord never pronounced, nor ever will pronounce, a sentence more terrible than this: to be without God in eternity is Hell

Depart from Me, ye cursed:1 cursed supremely in that departure itself Here we have one instance of that series of correlatives running through all the revelations of this stern doctrine which no subtlety of exposition can soften away. Come, ye blessed of my Father!2 Depart from Me, ye cursed! Men in their integrity come; men in their integrity depart. But, positively also, the condemnation of judgment is to punishment internal and external: the departure is not only from Christ but into everlasting punishment, kolasin aioonion. The internal mourning because of Him3 is always connected in the figurative language of Scripture with external suffering, and that inflicted by the wrath of the Lamb.4 But what the dread figures mean it is not possible to define. We know

that no material emblems can describe, certainly they cannot enhance, the blessedness of the vision of God; and we know also that no material emblems can describe the misery of the conscious eternal exclusion from that vision. And the penalty will be eternal. These shall go away into everlasting punishment.5 Here there is no room for a timeless abstraction in the interpretation of the term aionios. Whatever it means to the righteous it means also to the wicked, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord.6 The word punishment implies the abiding continuance of him upon whom the wrath of God abideth.7 1Matthew 25:41; 2Matthew 25:34; 3Revelation 1:7; 4Rev. 4:16; 5Matthew 25:46; 62 Thessalonians 1:9; 7John 3:36

3. The judgment on the lost is regarded in Scripture as condemnation to bear the fruit of his own doings. Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.1 There is the sinner from whom the neglected talent is withdrawn, leaving the spirit officeless, unmoored, and shut out: take from him the pound.2 And there are the enemies of whom it is said: bring hither and slay them before Me. But always the dreadful burden is laid upon the sinner himself. He is viewed as the author of his own character, and as responsible for his own ruin. In the integrity of his body and soul he reaps the fruit of his own devices: part of his sin was the sensual misuse of the body; part of his sin was the turning away of his spirit from God; in the reunion of body and soul he suffers the result. And from this it follows that the final condemnation is that of a nature now fitted for it: the harvest is the character formed by the seedtime. There lies the most awful aspect of this awful subject. It is not that the Judge assigns eternal punishment for temporal sin; but that sin is taken confirmed into eternity. Non cessante peccato nequit cessare poena. It is not because man has sinned only, but because his nature is turned away from God, and he sins still: one of our Lord’s most solemn words of threatening prediction was this, Ye shall die in your sins.3 1Galatians 6:7; 2Luke 19:24-27; 3John 8:24

4. That judgment will be accepted and submitted to by all throughout the universe. No profounder mystery is in the Apocalypse than the hallelujahs which are uttered over the demonstrations of the Divine wrath as they proceed from judgment to judgment in their direful procession. Our Lord gives hints, of some kind of remonstrance at the last. He interprets beforehand the thoughts of many hearts as they receive from Him recompense for deeds done, or not done, to Him in the persons of men, His representatives: as if, in His own absence as a revealed Savior, human faith working by love might find in His needy ones Himself in another form. But He says nothing of a thought remaining in any created spirit suspecting or censuring a miscarriage of justice. On this, however, we dare not dwell CONFIRMATION OF PAST SENTENCE

It is part of the dignity of the saints that the judgment in their case will be only the ratification of a previous decree in their favor and already known to themselves

1. Though judged, in the more general sense of that administrative word, they shall not come into condemnation.1 Death was really the judgment to them; men have often personified it in their instinctive hope as the Great Revealer. Through it they pass into the presence of Christ Who receives them as a Judge and Divider. Moreover, some descriptions of the resurrection, and notably the great one of St. Paul, describe it as in its discrimination a preliminary decision. This may be harmonized with the fact of a judgment, even in their case a judgment to come.2 1John 5:24; 2Acts 24:25

2. Their Place and order in the State of salvation has yet to be determined. Shame and everlasting contempt1 are only for the ungodly; but Daniel himself must stand in his lot at the end of the days:2 in the degree purchased by a life of duty. And this suggests a wonderful paradox, that believers are in Christ even while standing before Him, and they hope, like St. Paul, to be found in Him.3 And still another passage finds here its solution Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world?4 which is St. Paul's version of our Lord's Judging the twelve tribes of Israel.5 Every individual saint will be confirmed in the state and position for which his Christian character fitted him. He will have his own particular one among the many mansions; his own specific jurisdiction, whether over the ten or the five cities; his own degree of the Vision of God 1Daniel 12:2; 2Daniel 12:13; 3Php 3:9; 41 Corinthians 6:2; 5Matthew 19:28

3. It may be said finally that the last Judgment will, in the case of believers, introduce a new economy of service in the universal kingdom of the Triune God, no longer the kingdom of the Mediator. The infinite variety of employments which the Savior always in His parables suggests to our expectation and hope will occupy the talents and individual gifts of the redeemed for ever. But in that new world they are not, nor can again be, in probation. Their state is confirmed, and will admit only of a necessary development of good. Hence there is not, nor can be, any Second Day of Judgment

4. The judgment on evil spirits is represented as in their case also the confirmation of a past sentence. Of them it is said that God spared not angels when they sinned, but cast them down to hell, and committed them to pits of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment:1 which judgment is further said to be the one last judgment of the great day.2 The angels who never fell will without any ordeal be established in their everlasting order; and, with saints already saved, witness the judgment of the rest and join with the Redeemer in the exercise of that judgment they joining as His attendant ministers, and the saints in virtue of their union with Him as their Head 1 2 Peter 2:4; 2Jude 1:6 THE CONSUMMATION The final issues of our Lord's return may be said to be the consummation of all things

This, with reference to the Redeemer, will be the end of His mediatorial kingdom as such, while as it respects Man it will be the finished redemption of the race, and its restoration to the Divine ideal and primary purpose of the Creator. In regard to the scene of redemption, the world, it will bring in a renewal or transformation; and, as to the Church of Christ collectively and individually, it will seal its perfection in the eternal vision of God and blessedness of the heavenly state

Generally, there is a close of all things which is only a new beginning of all. The supreme telos is the point, the vanishing point, to which all the rays of revelation converge: Then cometh the end.1 With reference to this, as well as to all subordinate processes of His work, our Lord said: The things concerning Me have an end.2 As every part of the Bible, and the whole volume of the Book, is finished with its Amen, so the great and boundless scheme which it records waits for its close, when the entire universe shall respond with its own Amen. But with this there is always conjoined the idea of a new beginning

Behold, I make all things new.3 The re-established order will be so new that the old things shall hardly come to remembrance; but the relation between the new and the old is in many points a mystery reserved. Meanwhile, the combination of these is the only notion of CONSUMMATION, an end opening to a new beginning. The end of human development, combined of sin and

redemption, is but a contribution from one little section of what is to us an unlimited universe presided over by a Being Whose infinite resources prepare our feeble minds for wonders which we cannot sketch, even in outline, to our imagination

Human science has taught us much of the amazing consummation which the physical universe has reached; the science of faith knows no limits to its hope. There is a third tetelestai of the Divine economy, the fullness of time in the fullest sense, which we expect. The first was when the world was finished as the scene of redemption: the second was when the Lord's cry declared the new creation finished. We must reverently look at the dim reflection of the third as it is thrown upon us only from the Word of God. The contemplation ought to be one of wonder and of joy. As Abraham rejoiced to see the day of Christ in the distance, so may all the children of faithful Abraham rejoice to see in the future the day for which all other days were made 11 Corinthians 15:24; 2Luke 22:24; 3Revelation 21:5 THE MEDIATORIAL KINGDOM There will be an end and beginning of the Redeemer's Kingdom, as it is a kingdom of grace translated into glory

1. The mediatorial economy will cease in its relation to the Triune God: the redemptional Trinity which introduced the economy of subordination in the Two Persons will be again the absolute Trinity. The Son Incarnate will cease to mediate; as Incarnate He will be for ever subordinate, but there will be nothing to declare His subordination: no mediatorial rule over enemies, no mediatorial service or worship of His people. The Triune God will be seen by all mankind in the face of Jesus Christ:1 and the mediation of grace will become the mediation of glory. The Intercessor will pray for us no more, but will reveal the Father openly for ever. A mediator is not a mediator of one;2 but the prayer of our Lord will then have been fulfilled: that they also may be one in Us.3 Man taken up into the US of the Triune God will need a mediator no longer 12 Corinthians 4:6; 2Galatians 3:20; 3John 17:21

2. The kingdom will cease because its ends will have been attained. Then cometh the end when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father:1 to the Father as the Representative of the Trinity; when He shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. The process of His victories is described in the Apocalypse: first and last, the Antichrist, which is a spirit of infidelity, anti, AGAINST CHRIST, having many forms, such as the Beast and the Man of Sin, and also a final personal manifestation; every description of heathenism to the ends of the earth; the corruptions of Christianity, exhibited in Babylon and the Second Beast and the Harlot; and finally Death, the last enemy that shall be destroyed. In all these conflicts the Church is the fellowship of companions in tribulation and in the kingdom and patience in Jesus Christ.2 We are one with our Lord, and He is one with us, in this progressive warfare and final victory. It is as Head over all things to the Church3 that the Redeemer exercises now and will then close His rule; nor is any other suppression of authority alluded to than that which opposed the designs of His mediatorial kingdom. Moreover, there is nothing said of the destruction, only of the putting down, of all hostile authority and power 11 Corinthians 15:24; 2Revelation 1:9; 3Ephesians 1:22

3. The kingdom will have a new beginning: new as the kingdom of the new heavens and a new earth1 made one. The Spirit of Christ will be the immanent bond between Him and us, between us and the Holy Trinity: He that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit.2 The Incarnate Person will be glorified then as never before: His personality as Divine will be no more veiled or obscured by any humiliation, nor will it be intermittently revealed. GOD shall BE ALL IN ALL:3 first in the Holy

Trinity, and then through Christ in us 12 Peter 3:13; 21 Corinthians 6:17; 31 Corinthians 15:28

ERRORS On this subject some errors, chiefly ancient, may be noted

1. Amongst early struggles to reconcile the absolute unity of God with the economical Trinity, we find traces of the Noetian and Sabellian heresy that with the consummation of Christ's work the triune essence of Deity will be dissolved: the Holy Ghost ceasing to be the name of the operative manifestation of God, and the Son surrendering His office and sinking into the Deity, so that in this sense God shall be all in all. But the relation of the Son to the Father is distinctly personal at the close as throughout: the word which describes to us the very last agency of Him Who has done so much as the Mediator of God and men defines the last act of the Son in His very relation of Sonship; for the kingdom is delivered up to God, even the Father.1 The sanctified host of mankind is one with Christ; and thus the sanctifying work of the Spirit is ended. The Trinitarian economy has ceased; and God the Holy Trinity is all in all 11 Corinthians 15:24

2. It has been thought that the Son, having accomplished the object for which He assumed our nature, would renounce that nature and give it up also to the Father. But neither can we give up our Head nor will the Head give up His members. His human nature is a vesture that He will not lay aside; indeed it is more than His vesture, it is part of His eternal Self. There is no independent human personality to be renounced

3. A subtle notion sometimes slumbering and sometimes waking in theology may now and then be detected, that another government will be finally set up, wider, deeper, more catholic and more effectual than the old; and that among the all things new will be new expedients correcting the deficiencies and anomalies of the superseded economy

Shrinking from the plain assertion that the failure of the Son incarnate will be repaired by some new and better dispensation, this nevertheless they perpetually hint at. In fact, every speculation that insists upon finding a basis for the hope of a universal restoration of all creatures to God really proceeds from such a thought MANKIND SAVED AS A RACE In the consummation Mankind as such and as a race will be saved. The Divine purpose in the creation of man in His own image will be accomplished: through the atoning mediation of Him Who came to destroy the works of the devil1 among men. The whole history of the race has been the carrying out of one design: one design in the attainment of which many others have been subsumed, and the attainment of which may open out many others. , Here it is important to remember that the purpose of our Lord's coming is always regarded as being accomplished. He came as the predestined and necessary Savior. The Old-Testament prophetic triumph was, He shall not fail nor be discouraged;2 the New-Testament response is, He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet;3 and the song of all the Scripture is that His right hand and His holy arm hath gotten Him the victory.4 The redeeming purpose of Christ as to the family of Adam must, be accomplished, and has been accomplished: not merely in the gathering of an elect residue from the generations, but in the salvation of humanity. But how can this be said to be the case? There are two answers: the race in its vast majority, the race as such, is actually saved; and as to the residue, it will be cast out not only from God but from mankind, and not accounted of 11 John 2:8; 2Isaiah 42:4; 31 Corinthians 15:25; 4Psalms 98:1

1. The majority of the objects of redemption are either already or certainly will be the Lord's for ever; He is not only Lord of the dead1 by prerogative, but also by actual possession. All infants whose development has been cut off on earth pass by prescriptive right to Him. And we may believe, without being able to state positively the grounds of our assurance, that many of the men of goodwill who never heard the angelic peace on earth will nevertheless sing glory to God in the highest.2 This we seem to hear in the proleptic description given by the King of those who will marvel at their deliverance and their Deliverer: When saw we Thee?3 Of the increase of His government4 apart from the direct preaching of His Gospel we know little, but we may hope much. And as that increase runs on into the best ages of the Millennium, the flow of the nations into the city will abound more and more. Although there will be a great falling away, and the Son of Man leaves with us His question Shall He find faith?5 that defection will be only for a short season 1Romans 14:9; 2Luke 2:14; 3Matthew 25:37; 4Isaiah 9:7; 5Luke 18:8

2. In the same sense that it is said, All Israel shall be saved,1 it may be said that Mankind is saved. The lost will not mar the unity of the race: disowned of God they are disavowed of men: What is the chaff to the wheat?2 They are supposed to leave the communion of humanity and go into the fellowship of the devil and his angels,3 into shame and everlasting contempt;4 and of them also we may say, They went out from us, but they were not of us.5 But our best argument and assurance is that He Who knows the price of His own life and death shall be satisfied.6 1Romans 11:26; 2Jeremiah 23:28; 3Matthew 25:41; 4Daniel 12:2; 51 John 2:19; 6Isaiah 53:11 ERRONEOUS HYPOTHESES

There are two opposite theories respecting the Redemption of the Race which differ from the one given in the Scripture: that of those who maintain the doctrine of a final restoration of all moral intelligences, and of men in particular; and that of those who think that the reprobate members of the race will be annihilated. Some intermediate speculations retain the doctrine of an eternal continuance of the lost, but endeavor in various ways to extenuate the idea of its punishment, or mitigate its horror

UNIVERSALISM The belief or the hope that the consummation of all things will be the restoration of all intelligent beings to the image and favor of God has found advocates in every age. This hope has always sought its best support in what may be called a priori arguments; it claims also some passages of Scripture as maintaining its principle; but it has never been accepted by the Christian Church generally from the beginning, nor in any of its branches until its recent development, I. Its general principles, however plausible, admit in every case of a sufficient answer

1. If it is said that punishment is in the nature of things only remedial, that assertion cannot be maintained. Reformation is the design of chastisement; and the amendment of the offender is necessarily bound up with our notion of corrective discipline; but the idea of penalty that underlies all human thinking on this subject has in it no other element than that of retribution. If appeal is made from human jurisprudence to Divine, then we have only to say that the Scripture at least carefully distinguishes between pure chastisement, which aims to amend the offender and deter others from like offence, and the vindication of law. While prevention, reformation, and retribution co-exist in the judicial principles in human jurisprudence, —none can deny this, —they co-exist also in the Divine economy. As the last extreme in the former is the infliction of pure penalty, so it is in the latter: there is a sin unto death1 in the court of man's justice, and there is also in that of

Divine. As an argument for necessary restoration this fails also when the test of experience is applied to it. There is no connection between suffering the penalty of transgression and amendment of life. If the latter follows the former, it is through the operation of something besides the penalty. Although we are not supposed to be yet on Scriptural ground, we cannot but point to the perpetual strain of its warning against neglect of the purposes of discipline, the issue of which is said to be a state of reprobation that cannot be amended. What the Bible describes we see in human life: that men, rebelling against chastisements and the Spirit of grace that inflicts them, go on to more and more ungodliness, hardened by their calamities. And if the penalty remains, without the grace of probation, what rational judgment can make the design of punishment an argument for necessary restoration to God 1 The natural religion of mankind has, with a true instinct, regulated its conceptions of the future by the principle of a final and strict retribution as such. And in the revealed religion of the Bible we find such a testimony as this: Vengeance is Mine, I will repay, saith the Lord.2 Earlier in the same Epistle, St. Paul asks: Is God unrighteous Who taketh vengeance? (I speak as a man) God forbid, for then how shall God judge the world?3 If the two sentences are weighed, Emoi ekdikeesis and ho epiferoon teen orgeen, and the emphasis of the last, the wrath, observed, it will be impossible to doubt that there is a coming manifestation of the Divine indignation against sin with which the amendment of the sufferer has nothing to do. This is felt by all who regard the threatened death as an extinction of the condemned spirit, of whom we shall speak more hereafter 11 John 5:16; 2Romans 12:19; 3Romans 3:5-6

2. The argument against a final condemnation of any intelligent creature is often urged on the general ground of the tendency of all the works of God towards perfection. It is assumed as a principle that, if a Supreme Controller of all development exists, He must make all His works issue well in the end. It is hard to resist this argument: it seems logically unanswerable. This is the strong plea of Optimism; what we call evil is made the necessary stage to ultimate good. An analogy is sometimes drawn with the phenomena of the physical universe; but this is an unfortunate analogy, for the perfect development sacrifices many individuals on the way. It would be only answering the argument according to its folly to say that the perfectibility of the race is consistent with the final loss of many individuals from it. But the fact is, that any such perfectibility, apart from the leaven of the Gospel, does not seem a reasonable theory. The progression of the race, intellectually, socially, and aesthetically, may be granted; on the whole it is advancing steadily. That progress is, on the one hand, much due to the Gospel; and, on the other, it is by no means synonymous with moral improvement. High culture and conformity to perfect law do not necessarily go together. As to the individual we often see a manifest progression in all that is evil down to the last, in unhappy connection with a steady progression in all that is intellectually good. Moreover, the argument, as a whole, proves too much: if it is insisted that all God’s works must reach a standard of perfection, we are obliged to invert the application, and ask why they were imperfect at any stage This and many other pleas of the Universalist must be reduced to silence by the plain fact that evil exists

II. The argument from Scripture is more strictly within the reach of our faculties; and this must to us be the final arbiter. Here we find the general representations of the Divine character appealed to, then the special design of the Atonement, and lastly express declarations of the New Testament as to the issue of the whole work of Christ

1. The strength of the first plea is simply this: that if the Divine Being is infinite in love, infinite in power, and infinite in wisdom, it is impossible that any creature of His hands should be shut out from His presence eternally. There is something in this plea that almost disarms resistance; until we call to mind that both the revelation of nature, which knows the terrors of the Lord and persuades men and that of revelation, conspire to exhibit to us a Being who contradicts the argument. The love of God as an attribute is always carefully qualified in such a way as to guard it from perversion. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son [to be] the propitiation for our sins:1 it requires an hilasmon, provides it for the world, and mourns over its rejection by many. There are necessary limits to the exertion of the Divine power, if not to the power itself; and the relation of a Moral Governor to free intelligences gives one of those necessary limitations, at least in the doctrine of Scripture. And in Scripture it is literally the Wisdom of God that predicts its own failure: because I have called and ye refused!2 This style of argument leads to Atheism, or Manichaeism, as the case may be; but not legitimately to Universalism. Whatever force it has on this subject must issue to the advantage of the annihilationist principle. But the fact is, however strange the assertion may seem, that, with the Bible in our hands, we must make no appeal to the nature of God in the abstract. It would, if pressed to the utmost, render the great Atonement a superfluous exhibition of resources against evil; nay more, it would pursue the difficulty farther back, and ask why evil was permitted at all. Both the beginning and the continuance of sin are inscrutable; but the one not more than the other 11 John 4:10; 2Proverbs 1:24

2. The argument from the design of the Atonement is still more easily answered. We must, of course, accept the statements of the New Testament on this subject, as there is no room here for abstract discussion of what we might conceive the Redemption should be. It is said that Christ came to put away sin,1 atheteesin which indeed is very strong, but does not involve the idea of universal abolition, as the context shows. Nor does the passage which says that Christ was manifested to destroy the works of the devil,2 lusee

There is not a single allusion to the Sacrifice which makes its object the annihilation of moral evil. The Atonement has provided for the effectual destruction of sin in those who receive it; and we maintain, with Scripture, that it availed for many who nevertheless perish, whatever that word may mean. St. Paul’s words are urged, that He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth;3 with which must be connected: by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself.4 The context shows that these passages mainly refer to the redemption of mankind as the bringing back of the race to its unity with the other orders of the universe. We must remember here the fundamental canon of the analogy of Scripture. It is declared of the same Redeemer that He taketh not hold of angels;5 and, whatever the mysterious reconciliation between man and the other orders of intelligence may mean, it cannot signify that the Savior has reconciled the devil and his angels to God. He was made a little lower than the angels that He, by the grace of God, should taste death for everyMan 1:6 This is a flexible text The Predestinarian understands huper pantos of the whole mass of the actually redeemed: all for whom the Lord died are saved. The Universalist takes the word in its widest extension: he may follow Origen, who interpreted huper pantos not for every man, but for everything, and read not chariti de Theou, by the grace of God, but choris Theou, outside of God: thus bringing all sinners, from the greatest to the least, within the sphere of redemption. We maintain that the context limits it to man; and that

the entire New Testament speaks of two designs in the Atonement: one extending to the whole race, and the other limited to its actual beneficiaries. Thus it is said that [the free gift came] upon all men unto justification of life.7 But it speaks of God, the Savior of all men, as the Savior specially of those that believe.8

1Hebrews 9:26; 21 John 3:8; 3Ephesians 1:10; 4Colossians 1:20; 5Hebrews 2:16; 6Hebrews 2:9; 7Romans 5:18; 81 Timothy 4:10

3. It is said that a few allusions to the final consummation expressly foreannounce a restoration of all things to God. That they are few is no argument against them: the express assertions of everlasting penalty are also few. Nor is it a refutation that they seem to contradict others; for there are on many subjects seemingly antithetical statements, the reconciliation of which must be deferred to eternity. But the passages quoted in the Restoration service have no direct reference to the question: those which are quoted against it were spoken expressly on this subject and no other. St. Paul in the sayings of the resurrection chapter, so often pleaded, obviously refers only to the design of Christ's death as accomplished in His saints: the keynote of the whole is Christ the first-fruits;1 and then they that are Christ's at His coming. These are the ALL of whom it is said that, as they died in Adam, in Christ they shall be made alive: it will be true that the whole race of the dead will live again, but not in Christ. The Lord will put down all rule and all authority and power.2 Both of these and of death the verb katargein is used, which does not include the idea of literal destruction; and when it is added that God may be All in all,3 we must understand that GOD is all, as distinguished from the mediatorial and intermediate government through man's Representative, and God in all the saved, who alone are mentioned. To the enemies under His feet4 are elsewhere opposed the possession whom He hath redeemed and purified unto Himself:5 here are the opposite poles throughout eternity 11 Corinthians 15:23; 2ver. 1 Corinthians 15:24; 3ver. 1 Corinthians 15:28; 4ver. 1 Corinthians 15:27; 5Titus 2:14

III. There has been a steadfast protest against this dogma in the catholic Church of Christ from the beginning; although many influential individuals in early times held it, and some more modern sects have striven to bring it into vogue. Origen sometimes more boldly, sometimes more timorously, advocated the idea of a universal restitution: not Restoration as of man merely, but UNIVERSALISM, including Satan and his angels. Destrui novissimus inimicus ita intelligendus est, non ut substantia ejus, quae a Deo est, pereat sed ut voluntas inimica, quae non a Deo sed ab ipso processit, intereat. Destruetur ergo non ut non sit, sed ut inimicus non sit et mors. Nihil enim Omnipotent! impossible est, NEC INSANABILE EST aliquid Factori suo. . . . Quae quidem a nobis etiam cum magno metu et cautela dicuntur, discutientibus magis quam pro certo et definito statuentibus. Origen was written against and formally condemned. He had few followers, though Diodorus of Tarsus, Gregory of Nyssa, Theodore, and a few others followed hesitatingly in his track The early Creeds note the progress of the catholic doctrine. The Apostles' and the Nicene speak only of the life everlasting. The Athanasian adds: Ad cujus adventum omnes homines resurgere habent cum corporibus suis, et redituri sunt de factis propriis rationem, et qui bona egerunt ibunt in vitam aeternam, qui mala in ignem aeternum. In the Middle Ages the Pantheistic mystics favored alternately the extinction of evil and its transformation into good. Some of the sectaries that troubled the age of the Reformation revived the notion of universal restoration, and were specifically condemned by the Lutheran Confessions. In modern times a large number of sects have arisen, especially in America, who hold this doctrine; some of them deriving their name

from it. But it has never been taught in any Confession of Christendom; however largely it may enter into the private speculations and hopes of individual thinkers

ANNIHILATION The end that Universalism reaches in one way is in another way reached by the hypothesis of ANNIHILATION, which saves the race as a whole at the expense of the very existence of the unsaved part of it. As in the alternative hypothesis, we have to consider some fundamental principles; then the direct testimonies of Scripture; and lastly its historical relations to the creed of the Church

I. The principles underlying this view may be regarded as opposite aspects of the one fundamental argument, that man has no immortality apart from the gift of Christ, and that this immortality is the one blessing of His redemption

1. The question of man's natural immortality is not allowed to be absolutely decisive; and perhaps more has been made to depend on this in the controversy than it will bear. Those who maintain that in the image of God, impressed upon man, there was a reflection in the creature of His eternity, and that this natural image was not destroyed by the Fall, are in possession of an argument which settles the subject at once. That is undoubtedly the view of Scripture, which nowhere asserts or proves the deathlessness of the human spirit any more than it asserts or proves the being of God. To us, therefore, the question is determined at the outset. But our conviction has no force against those who maintain that the gift of immortality was forfeited when man sinned

2. The question, therefore, must revert to the other aspect of it. Was the benefit of redemption the restoration of immortality, or a new gift of it, to the fellowship of those found in Christ? This is asserted by the advocates of Annihilation, whose manifold arguments may be met in manifold ways

(1.) First, there are two aspects of Christ's redeeming intervention, one absolutely universal and one particular. As to the former, in whatsoever sense the race of man died in Adam it lives again in Christ. The universal resurrection is the proof of this; and on the ground of it all men are dealt with, not as on probation for eternal existence, but as on probation for their destiny in that eternal existence. The reconciliation of God to man, or to the whole world, implies that all men are by their very birthright members of a race saved from extinction. This we believe, because we believe in universal redemption

Annihilationists do not believe it. They limit the benefit of our Lord's relation to the race to the offer of living for ever. They reach the end of Predestinarianism in a way of their own: Predestinarianism consigns the unredeemed to eternal reprobation, the annihilationist theory to eternal extinction. Both deny to the race as a race the reality of redemption in Christ; and make it matter of individual experience

(2.) A special and individual redemption there undoubtedly is; it does not, however, consist in the negative immortality, but in the positive life, which is in the Christian system never existence merely nor continuing to exist. On this the Lord's own words are decisive: I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.1 Life is a gift that a man may have or not have now: he that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.2 Surely ouk opsetai zooeen is not a phrase

that could signify extinction: it is not that he shall see death but that he shall not see life. And St John's Epistle makes this, if possible, more plain: he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.3 Life is in Christ; life is Christ; and Christ is a possession which a man may have or not have, either in time or to eternity. It has nothing whatever to do with continued existence as such. The only passage that even seems to hint at the contrary is in the same Epistle: he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.4 But there the contrast is with the world and its passing lusts, in comparison of which religion and its fruits are permanent; just as in another passage the life of regeneration is contrasted with the perishable things of time: being born again, not of corruptible seed but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth [for ever] For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away; but the word of the Lord endureth for ever.5 In these passages there is no thought of extinction in any sense. The world does not perish save in its fashions. The phenomenal universe will in some form abide for ever. But pure and perfect existence, clothed with all the blessedness of the life of God, will be revealed only when the phenomena as such have disappeared 1John 10:10; 2John 3:36; 31 John 5:12; 41 John 2:17; 51 Peter 1:23-24

3. The Annihilationist hypothesis meets the Universalist on common ground with respect to certain fundamental or a priori principles; while, on some others, they are singularly at variance

(1.) It is common to the two systems to dilate on the impossibility of reconciling the eternal misery of a punished soul with the attributes of God as He is depicted in Scripture. But there is no sound argument in this: at least what strength it has must lie on the Universalist side. That God should destroy a soul that He had created is as inconsistent with some of His attributes, His power for instance, taken alone, as the eternal punishment is inconsistent with His love, taken alone. In fact, this system of thought does not relieve the difficulty, save in appearance. How could the power of an omnipotent being suffer rebellion to begin? Having suffered it to begin, how could it be baffled finally, and for ever, in the attempt to save the sinner? The abiding continuance of sin and its necessary doom is, in some sense, a more conceivable, a more tolerable, idea than its origination. These improvements on the theology of Scripture do seem to unite in ridding the universe of every trace that sin has existed, in restoring God to His supremacy, and thus in delivering our minds from one of the heaviest burdens they can bear. But they cannot blot out the fact that evil has been permitted, and wrestled with, and severely punished for generations uncounted, both in this and other worlds. They reconstruct our God; but the God they give us needs still to be reconstructed if certain human notions of Him are to prevail. Certainly the Divine Being never thus vindicates Himself. He does not speak of it as a strange thing that the universe should pay everlasting tribute to His holy justice. But this is, after all, speaking foolishly. All theories alike are confounded before this awful subject

(2.) Another argument, common to the two, is that the punishment of offences committed in time must needs have a temporal limit. But the analogy of the temporal penalties themselves is strong against measuring the consequences of the sin by its seeming importance; persistent sin against God is beyond all finite reckoning; and, lastly, there is no eternal punishment but of eternal sinning: the eternal state of separation from God is both sin and its punishment. It may be added that annihilation is to all intents and purposes an eternal punishment of sin committed in time: the Universalist escapes this difficulty; yet only to plunge-into another, that of making the Supreme the Author of a threatening of eternal doom which shall prevent its own execution. But we vainly talk

about the relations of time to eternity. And certain it is that the price set on the Atonement, and the penalty for rejecting it, are represented in the New Testament in a very different style from that adopted by this theory. The despised of the Cross hath no more sacrifice for sins:1 his sin remains without a covering, and me wrath of God abideth on him.2 Sinners rise again in a resurrection of condemnation:3 they are condemned already,4 but then their condemnation will be to everlasting punishment.5 Does the Scripture tell us that they are called up into their perfect existence in spirit and soul and body—created as it were anew—to perish as finding their misery in the consciousness of their loss? Then the fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation6 has no meaning; for whatever the penalty of Hades may be, annihilation must be in comparison a blessing and only a blessing. Moreover the second death is not annihilation. Of the beast and the false prophet it is said that these both were cast alive into a lake of fire.7 Of the devil it is said that he was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever . . . 8 THIS IS THE SECOND DEATH: corresponding to the second and better life in life: that which is more abundantly given.9

1Hebrews 10:26; 2John 3:36; 3John 5:29; 4John 3:18; 5Matthew 25:46; 6Hebrews 10:27; 7Revelation 19:1-21; Revelation 20:1-15; 8Revelation 20:10-14. 9John 10:10

II. The argument in support of the final annihilation of the unsaved portion of mankind lays much stress on the terms of the Biblical vocabulary concerning life and death, and the meaning of everlasting as the predicate of both. Life is held synonymous with existence, and death with ceasing to exist; and everlasting is a term which is made to suit the theory of each respectively: applied to life it has its full significance of unending duration, applied to death its significance is reduced to absolute or perfect. Appeal is made to the sense in which these words, with their various correlatives of destruction, perishing, and so forth, are used in classical Greek

1. With regard to this last argument it is enough to say that the whole phraseology of revelation, especially New-Testament revelation, has undergone a great and momentous change. Scarcely one of the religious and ethical terms of classical Greek but has been raised to a higher meaning. No writer would have protested more earnestly than Plato against his terms for destruction being applied to the final destiny of what he thought the immortal spirit of man. It may be said, further, that the New Testament did not take these words directly from classical Greek, but from the Septuagint. The Septuagint will speak for itself. Very many passages might be cited in which the strongest terms that express destruction are used without involving anything like the idea of extinction. Let us take one passage, for instance, which singularly unites some of the strongest of all: it must be cited in full. Poimenes polloi diefqeiran ton ampelwna mou emolunan thn merida mou edwkan merida epiqumhthn mou eis erhmon abaton. eteqh eis afanismon apwleias di’ eme afanismw hfanisqh pasa h gh oti ouk estin anhr tiqemenos en kardia.1 Here is a constellation of the entire terminology. But was the pleasant land of Jehovah abolished, or annihilated? The answer is given by Jehovah Himself. In the sublime words that follow we read: They have sown wheat, but shall reap thorns; they have put themselves to pain, but shall not profit; and they shall be ashamed of your revenues because of the fierce anger of the Lord.2 The application of these words to our present subject is obvious: no flesh shall have peace,3 and that because no man layeth it to heart.4 But they are quoted to show how little truth there is in the sweeping assertions that the inspired terminology of destruction is the terminology of annihilation. The student will do well in this matter, and in the interpretation of the New Testament generally, to track every word

through the Concordance of Trommius 1Jeremiah 12:10-12; 2Jeremiah 12:13; 3ver.Jeremiah 12:12; 4ver. Jeremiah 12:11

2. A careful examination of the leading terms Life and Death as used in the New Testament will show that, as they are applied to the spirit of man, they mean something superadded to mere existence, either as a blessing or as the opposite of blessing. Life is evermore the communication of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus;1 it is the correlative of salvation, blessedness and union with God. It is the opposite of condemnation, of misery, of the Divine displeasure; never the antithesis of annihilation, not even in relation to the bodily existence, and much less in relation to the existence of the spirit. Death is the correlative of the sentence of condemnation, of the withdrawal of the Spirit, and of a state of alienation from God: those who have not passed from death unto life1 are said to be dead in trespasses and sins;3 and we may enlarge the application of St. Paul's word concerning one dead while she liveth.4 Anyone who traces it through the New Testament must come to the conclusion that it expresses the exact opposite of the new life, the life eternal, which is imparted by Christ. Hence the advocates of the opinion we now consider are obliged to resort to a proleptic sense: sinners are counted dead by anticipation. But it might as well be said that the saints have not, but only shall have, everlasting life

Similarly, the synonyms which vary the idea of death, or rather which describe the way in which it is inflicted, do not carry the notion of absolute suppression of existence. The strongest term that is ever used is applied by our Lord to the state from which the prodigal was rescued: he was lost or was destroyed, apolooloos een, and is found.5 By that one word Jesus for ever rescued this verb from the misapplication forced upon it: the loss of the soul is a state the opposite of its being found again. The prodigal lost in the far country came to himself first, and then came to his father; but he had been destroyed, or had destroyed himself. If the Restorationists, using this passage against that doctrine of annihilation which none more forcibly argue against than they, appeal to it as confirming the hope that those who are lost in the other world will be found again, they are met by another most peremptory word of Christ, Good were it for that man if he had not been born:6 for that man who was the son of perdition,7 the huios tees apooleias, a prodigal who was not found; for, had there been a certainty of his coming back from his far country, eternal life would have made his birth a blessing notwithstanding all intermediate woes. A member of the same family of terms is used by St. Paul when he says that at the appearing of Christ those who are found not having obeyed the Gospel suffer punishment, even eternal destruction from the face of the Lord,8 olethron. The construction of this passage is such, at all points, as to be a warning to theorists on this solemn subject. The addition of aioonion would be needless if the olethron meant what they suppose it to mean: absolute extinction of being. As eternal life is the confirmation for ever of a life that now is in Christ, so eternity is added to the word which St. Paul elsewhere uses to express a present penalty of hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition:9 men empiptousin eis, temptation and a snare; these also buthizousin eis, destruction. This everlasting destruction is to take place when He shall come:10 it is not therefore before the judgment, nor is it after the judgment. It is from the presence of the Lord, apó prosoópou toú Kuríou, for the meaning of which let the Septuagint vouch, which so translates in Genesis: They hid themselves from the presence of the Lord11 as the first effect of sin, and Cain went out from the presence of the Lord12 as the second and still worse effect, our text being the third and worst of all. Finally, as to the aionion, Daniel's eis aischuneen aionion is quite sufficient: what is everlasting contempt?13 But St. Paul

himself gives the law for his use of this word in this relation when he says, the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal:14 phenomenal or passing things, and abiding or eternal things, are the only correlatives

1Romans 8:2; 2John 5:24; 3Ephesians 2:1; 41 Timothy 5:6; 5Luke 15:32; 6Mark 14:21; 7John 17:12; 82 Thessalonians 1:9; 91 Timothy 6:9; 102 Thessalonians 1:10; 11Genesis 3:8; 12Genesis 4:16; 13Daniel 12:2; 142 Corinthians 4:18 III. The history of this phase of Christian speculation lends it no substantial help

1. Most of the earliest Fathers believed in the absolute eternity of the punishment of the reprobate. The first testimony after inspiration ceased is that of Clemens Romanus: meta gar to eselthein hamas ek tou kosmos ouk eti dunametha ekei esomologeesasthai ho metanoein. Justin Martyr asserts this, in opposition to Plato's teaching that they would last a thousand years; but some passages in his writings are thought to hesitate: for instance, when he says to Trypho, est an autas kai einai kai kolaxesthai o theos thelee, which, however, is a truth that all must admit. Sentences may be gleaned from the ante- Nicene writers which lean in almost every direction; but the idea of a total cessation of being, or of its gradual extinction, cannot be traced save perhaps in a few isolated passages of Hernias, Irenseus, and the Alexandrian Clement. The question, however, of these sporadic opinions is of very little importance; save as showing that the seeds of almost every subsequent speculation were early sown

2. Arnobius, at a later time, gave expression to the idea of a gradual cessation of sufferings, ending in the annihilation of the individual: "A corporalibus vinculis exsolutos expectat mors saeva, non repentinam adferens extinctionem, sed per tractum temporis cruciabilis poenae acerbitate consumens." This strange inversion of the dogma of purgatory was maintained here and there by many of the Fathers. Didymus of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa, perhaps Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Gregory of Nazianzum, inclined to this as philanthropoteron kai tou kolazontos epaxios, more charitable and more worthy of the Divine Punisher. But it is admitted that the strong, full, and scarcely checked stream of doctrine after Arnobius set the other way: neither turning aside to the Restitution of Origen nor to the Annihilation of Arnobius. During the Middle Ages a Pantheistic view of the absorption of all good and all evil too in God molded much thought, but it generally, though not always, took the form of the Apocatastasis

3. In modern times the tenet of an eventual annihilation of the perishing soul has been argued out with great ability by individual men, who have offered it to their fellow- Christians as a refuge from the dread doctrine which the Church of God in every age has found in the Bible. The notion has been elaborated with many diversities of hypothesis; and with an enthusiastic determination to make all things bend to it. It is not possible, nor is it necessary, to systematize the shapes which the central idea is in process of assuming: the witnesses to it do not agree, and we must wait till there is at least more semblance of agreement. Meanwhile, a few closing remarks may be made

(1.) It must be admitted that the theologians of this new school have steadfastly asserted some fundamental principles. They hold fast the doctrine of the eternal punishment of sin; and that of the absolute and inherent claims of the Divine righteousness. They do justice, in their manner, to the terrors of the Lord, and vindicate the reality of heavenly wrath against unrepenting and obdurate transgressors. They are among the most determined opponents of the Restitution theory in all its forms: regarding it as their most formidable rival for the suffrages of human mercy and hope. Both

these hypotheses set out with the foregone conclusion that every trace of evil must be swept out of the universe: each waiving the consideration that it has existed, and that the same supreme Will which permitted it to be, may, in His eternal wisdom, suffer it to continue under new conditions. But they are mutually intolerant: each on its own side of the cross of redemption thinks the other a despiser of that cross. The two hypotheses of Extinction and Universalism meet with no such thorough refutation as in the writings of their advocates respectively. The Annihilationists, however, pay a tribute to the Divine holiness, and the freedom of the human will, and the essential evil of sin, which their opponents at the other extreme fail to pay

(2.) But this is all that can be said. Their dogma is inconsistent with the Spirit's testimony concerning sin and righteousness and judgment, as these three are illustrated by the gift of Christ to the race. Sin is estimated in the New Testament by the price of its expiation; it is the act of man, generic and individual, possessed of a nature capable of offending an infinite Being. Before it was committed, that same nature was in the eternal counsel assumed by the Son of God to retrieve its consequences on behalf of the whole race: whatever objection may be urged against this high and catholic view, it must be maintained that the infinite value of the offering implied an infinite offence. According to this new view, man at the time of his transgression was only a living soul, not having yet the quickening Spirit, and therefore utterly incapable of such an offence. Christ comes not to save an immortal sinner; but to give a mortal sinner, who had sinned, the offer of immortality. Such a sin of such an Adam as this doctrine has invented is not matter for such an intervention. Nor does this doctrine comport with the Redeemer's finished and accepted righteousness. That was wrought out for the race; and restored as a free gift all that sin had forfeited. Now man, we repeat, did not forfeit the possibility of living for ever; he forfeited that life itself. If death were annihilation, that was reversed for the nature of man by Him who assumed it; if death were the forfeiture of eternal life in God, that was given back to all who should believe. [The free gift came] upon all men unto justification of life.1 Hence the judgment, with all its preliminaries, accessories, and results, is equally misapprehended. The resurrection belongs to all men as the fruit of the Atonement, because all men are by the Incarnation vivified by a Head common to all The mystery of the union between Christ and His Church is based upon a yet deeper, although not a more blessed, mystery, that of His union with mankind. It is the Son of man Who comes in His glory,2 not the Head of the Church; and in the final separation those who are not His He has LOST. The judgment will make the eternal distinction. Here our new dogma is uncertain and faltering. Some of its advocates, holding that death is the dissolution of an integer which does not exist, save as an integer, make the sinner a nonentity until he is recreated to be marred for ever. Others, maintaining the survival of part of the man, make that part of him pay the full penalty of retribution before the resurrection: on the one hand, denying that in the body the deeds done in the body are punished, while, on the other, they think they pay honor to the instant execution of judgment by making the resurrection the crisis of the despatching stroke, justice being at length satisfied. Some, however, protract the ages of suffering indefinitely, until, by some process of disintegration, of which neither Scripture nor philosophy knows anything, their sin has brought forth in eternity the death which it conceived in time. Meanwhile, the dreadful harmony, though not alas the melody, of Scripture, is set to the note that there will be a division of the one race of Adam: the innumerable company of the saved entering into the city brought down to the renewed earth, and the lost, with no mention of their number, WITHOUT the walls, with the devil and his angels.3 1Romans 5:18; 2Matthew 25:31; 3Revelation 22:15

(3.) Many other objections to this hypothesis of annihilation might be mentioned, which do not affect theology so much as isolated interpretations of Scripture, and the psychological or physiological theories of human nature which it forces or tempts those who accept it to adopt. The student must be constantly on his guard as to both these points; otherwise he will be bewildered by the variety of plausible arguments with which both the heavier and the lighter literature on this subject abound. But, after all, it cannot be too habitually remembered that this solemn question does not depend upon isolated texts, nor upon speculations as to the nature of personality and consciousness. It is connected with the great principles and steadfast tendency of all the teaching of revelation, which everywhere speaks to man as an immortal being, having an eternal destiny, the issues of which are bound up with his use of the means provided of God for his salvation in this probationary state INTERMEDIATE AND MITIGATING HYPOTHESES

There always have been, and still are, certain opinions held on this subject which can hardly be called intermediate, since they deny both the views already discussed, but which nevertheless aim to abate the extreme rigor of the Scriptural doctrine of eternal separation from God, They refuse to allow that any moral agent will ever perish out of existence; or that evil will be banished as such from the universe; but they introduce certain mitigations which must stand or fall on their own merits

1. It has been held by some that while the state of the lost is one of hopeless separation from the vision of the Blessed One, it will be also one of absolute submission to and even adoring contemplation of Divine justice. In other words, the final penalty of sin will be an everlasting poena damni, or sense of irreparable loss unrelieved by hope and accepted in despair. Certain indications of that feeling in the description of Dives and Lazarus are continued beyond Hades into the state beyond; and emotions made eternal which prove that the active rebellion of the sinning will is for ever over. This theory does justice to the undeniable truth that the empire of sin will be subverted and every created will brought into subjection. To suppose that lawless rebellion and defiance may continue eternally offends as much against the kingly authority of Christ as universal restoration offends against His priestly work. But it is hard to distinguish between the sentiment of submission to the Divine authority and the germ of holiness: as it has been sometimes described it is utterly inconsistent with eternal punishment. One of the most solemn words towards the close of Scripture says that fear hath torment,1 ho fobos kolasin echi

Fear is not torment in itself, but it hath torment; hath it in the germ, and what the full development is our Savior tells us: these shall go away into eternal punishment2 or kolasin aionion 11 John 4:18; 2Matthew 25:25

2. But, apart from this, the sentiments ascribed to the rich man by our Lord, and the word of Abraham to him, Son, remember! have been fondly dwelt upon, as implying a possible benefit of reflection which must be taken into account so far as Hades, or the Intermediate State, is concerned. A generous interpretation of our Lord’s words has been suggested by many most eminent divines, who connect them with those other words concerning a possible forgiveness of all sins save one in the other world. They put the whole strength of a possible repentance in the Remember; and suppose that the rich man’s regard for his brethren shows the first stage of it. The step from this is an easy one to converting processes that shall finally reduce the number of the irreparably lost. Others limit much of the severer language of punishment to that intermediate

state, leaving for the eternal condition a penalty adapted to a degraded, lowered, and comparatively unconscious existence. This singularly inverts the order of Scripture: assigning the sensuous woe to the state in which the body has no part, and forgetting the express reference to the punishment in the body of deeds done in the body

3. In ancient and in modern times much stress has been laid upon the infinite diversity in punishment and reward, as constituting an important element in our judgment on this solemn subject. It is observed that our Lord Himself, Who has uttered the most clear words of Scripture as to the eternal separation of two classes, has again and again referred to gradations in this eternal estate. There is no more definite prophetic teaching than that which speaks of the few stripes and the many stripes.1 And the charity of the Christian heart is perfectly justified in deducing from them the utmost possible legitimate inferences. But they must be legitimate: the words give no sanction to the idea that heaven and hell will shade off into each other by imperceptible degrees, or that the few stripes are disciplinary for salvation in opposition to the many stripes which are eternally punitive. Had this meaning been in our Lord's thoughts He might most easily have made that meaning clear. Collating such words, however, with others, we are bound to assume that, though the great gulf is fixed now in Hades, the judgment day will prove that the lost estate of some of the lost is more tolerable2 than that of others 1Luke 12:48; Luke 12:47; 2Matthew 10:15

4. But all palliative hypotheses and reasoning have, by a natural necessity, revolved back to the power and goodness of the Redeemer Himself, the last only hope of mortal distress: what reserves of infinite resource may be in Him! In the mystical contemplations of Augustine and other Fathers, and of multitudes since, may be heard occasionally the sublime but very bold idea of an Intercession that may avail to bring back the prodigals whose lost estate is described as apolesthai, even as the prodigal in time was lost and was found.1 How easy is it to form the conception of an effort put forth by the Great Restorer, urged by His own mercy, by the memory of His passion, and the compassionate appeals of His saints glorified, to create at least a place and a state, neither heaven nor hell, for the spoil of eternal justice! But He Who is the Sole Intercessor for man leaves no assurance of such an intercession: indeed He has done all that in Him lay to preclude the thought of any such possible intervention when the mystery of His kingdom is finished

1Luke 15:24 NEW HEAVENS AND EARTH Not only in psalm and figurative prophecy, but in plain teaching also, the new beginning and consummation of man's universe, of an actual heaven and earth, is taught in Scripture

1. Generally, there will be a regeneration of all things, as if there were a certain analogy with the salvation of the individual man: the earth, being justified or released from its condemnation, renewed and regenerate, and sanctified to God and man for ever. The original sentence will be repealed, and there shall be no more curse.1 The earth will be in the fullest sense sanctified; and then it will be said pre-eminently: every creature of God is good.2 So our Lord speaks of the general palingenesía, or new birth, in a designedly indeterminate way: in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of His glory.3 That is first in the present time: He now sits on that throne, and the Apostles now judge the twelve tribes of Israel. But it is also in the future. The same may be said of the times of restoration of all things.4 As man is to rise again, so in a certain sense will the scene of his history. When the heavens and earth are said to pass away and there was found no place for them,5 this must not only be harmonized with other words, as a vesture

shall Thou fold them up, and they shall be changed,6 but also with the Apocalyptic scenes that follow, which expressly declare: and I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea.6 This is evidently the new Genesis, with express reference to the former, no longer, as the prophet Isaiah predicted, to be remembered, nor come into mind.7 1Revelation 22:3; 21 Timothy 4:4; 3Matthew 19:28; 4Acts 3:21; 5Revelation 20:11; 6Hebrews 1:12; 7Isaiah 65:17

2. Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth. If this prediction refers to the physical world, the glowing descriptions that follow must also depict in earthly strains the consummate transformations of the final kingdom. St. Peter says: We, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.1 In the Apocalypse heaven and earth are made one: I John saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven.2 Hence what the present heaven and earth are to our probationary estate the future will be to our eternal and fixed state: not heaven to be ascended to from earth; but the Lord will make BOTH ONE. The highest heaven, like eternity, will be for ever unknown to man. God alone inhabiteth both. Our heaven will be our earth, and our earth heaven: the tabernacle of God is with men,3 the Incarnate Son dwelling in redeemed mankind as a temple, and redeemed mankind dwelling in Him; but both on a transfigured earth 12 Peter 3:13; 2Revelation 21:2; 3Revelation 21:3

3. This is all that we learn from the Bible. It is supposed by many that St. Paul introduces into the heart of his most theological Epistle, into one of the most didactic portions of the New Testament, a poetical reference to the entire ktisis as longing for and finally sharing in the glorious liberty of the children of God1 at the Adoption. And this would seem to imply, what the Scripture never asserts, that the irrational creature was subjected through man's sin to death, and will share in his redemption. But, unless it can be proved that the ktisis here is not groaning man as a creature, or heathenism subjected to vanity, this passage has no dogmatic force. Nor is such an extension of the great expectation necessary. When the Apocalypse says that there was no move sea,2 and that for the present phenomenal heaven and earth there was found no place,3 it teaches us to interpret the whole as meaning no more than that the scene and sphere of human development will undergo a corresponding change. As man's body will be fashioned after our Lord's glorious body, so the earth will be fashioned after the similitude of heaven. Men will not therefore be in every sense isaggeloi 1Romans 8:21; 2Revelation 21:1; 3Revelation 20:11

4. All this will take place through the power of Christ, by the agency of fire. But whatever agency the material fire may exert, the change upon our earth will not be effected by material fire alone. The result will be as utterly beyond any conception we now have as the spiritual body of Christ exalted in heaven. Withal it must be remembered that it is only the earth as the scene of redemption that will undergo this change. It is the earth that being overflowed with water perished1 which is reserved unto fire. In the vast greatness of the realms of God and His Christ we and our whole economy are but as the mote in the sunbeam; and it is an error to involve the entire universe in this consummation. Science may trace a connection between every atom of matter and the whole compass of material nature, and refuse to admit the possibility of the abstraction of our world from the sum of things. But we are now in a region in which physical knowledge is inarticulate or without authority; and, moreover, its own theories have nothing to say against the possible extinction of worlds. However, as the declaration, He made the stars also,2 at the beginning, refers only to the phenomenal relation of the universe to our earth, so, at the close,

there was found no place for them3 refers only to the sphere of human redemption 12 Peter 3:12; 2Genesis 1:16; 3Revelation 20:11

5. As to the renovation of the earth two opposite errors are to be observed, with many variations on them. One is that of a too spiritual view, which makes the material universe, like the idols, nothing in the world, and man's ethereal vehicle literally a spiritual body But we have no reason to think that anything made by God is destroyed: in this sense also The gifts and calling of God are without repentance.1 Worlds are known to be undergoing changes which to us are equivalent to disappearance; and creation and glorification may be henceforward an everlasting law. But the opposite is that of a too literal restoration. This way tends much Lutheran speculation, that makes corporeity the law and end of existence: the Gospel is supposed literally to be preached to every creature;2 the Eucharist to be the sustentation of both body and soul; the Holy Ghost as much the physical as the spiritual Lifegiver; and the redemption of Christ a restoration of all created nature, here the exact opposite of ancient Gnosticism. From this the transition is easy to a literal resurrection of all animated existence. Modern, like ancient, Millenarianism adopts this theory, so far as concerns the intermediate kingdom of Christ; and this is one of its many extreme difficulties 1Romans 9:29; 2Mark 16:15

ETERNAL LIFE The consummation of all consummations as it respects the human race is the entrance of the redeemed into eternal life. Viewed as to God this is the realization of His purpose with regard to mankind in the Incarnate Son. As to Christ it is His presentation of Himself, one with His own, to the eternal Father. Regarded with reference to the heavenly world it is the reconciliation of all the inhabitants of heaven and the race of man: the fellowship being now eternal and complete. As to the whole Church it is the sealing ratification of its oneness with its Head, for His possession and His service. As to the individuals of that Church it is the perfection of their own nature in itself and in that union with the Triune God which is eternal blessedness

I. What in human terms we call the Divine idea of humanity we must also in human terms speak of as not having been realized; precisely in the same sense, and in no other, as that in which it is said: It repented the Lord that He had made man on the earth.1 But the idea not fulfilled in the first Adam has been realized in the Second Adam. He, therefore, the spiritual Father and Head of the new humanity, will represent the new creation unto God, and present this new and better mankind faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy.2 The Adam of Paradise will not be the father of this race, but only the first among many brethren, sons of God through Christ. The human family will be added to the vast multitude of other aggregate families: with the distinction of a relation to God— of Whom every family in heaven and earth is named3—in the Eternal Son unshared by any other 1Genesis 6:6; 2Jude 1:24; 3Ephesians 3:15

II. Hence, there are some indications that the end of human history will be the restoration of harmony to the universe; as if man will then at length, perfectly redeemed, join with the other orders of intelligent creatures in the worshipping service of the eternal temple: their harmony, without human voices, not being counted perfect. But this does not sanction the speculative notion that the number of the saved from the earth will precisely fill up the vacancy caused by the fall of those who kept not their first estate. This speculation of the Middle Ages introduces a Predestinarian element into the final consummation which the Scripture-does not warrant. Nor does the testimony of Jesus by the Spirit of prophecy sanction the thought that the consummation

will unite all spirits with all men in the blessedness of union in God. Discord will be suppressed, but not in that way. The reconciliation of which St. Paul speaks is of heaven and earth: it does not couple hell. And the union is effected as the result of the Atonement by the sacrifice of Jesus, which was offered in human nature and in human nature alone

III. The consummation will be the perfection of the mystical body, the company of the Preserved in Jesus Christ. This Church of the redeemed will be, in eternal union with Christ, one with the Holy Trinity. Behold, the tabernacle of God is with mm, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people. But what is this tabernacle? I John saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.1 Reserving this last symbol, we must fix our thought upon the former; the glorified Church is the Tabernacle or Temple of God: the fullness of Him that filleth all in all.2 But it will be specially one with Immanuel, God with us. The last words concerning it drop the name church, inasmuch as that carries with it a suggestion of a larger mass out of which it is called. When the process is over, the Church, or ekkleesia, shall lose its name. It will be the Bride of Christ: a term often prepared for in earlier Scripture, but reserved for the last revelation, to intimate the unity of the corporate body of the elect, its everlasting and most intimate union with Christ, and the perfect love which He will bestow on it for ever. It will be His Kingdom also: we shall reign for ever and ever.3 This intimates, not that the Savior will rule over His Church, or through His Church rule over the universe of other worlds, but that the fellowship of the redeemed and glorified will be His servants to serve Him for ever. That holy company will be a priesthood also: to present eternal worship, not through Christ, but in Him and with Him

Priests eternally as worshippers, they will be kings for ever as servants. Their service will be no longer limited and partial. It will have the universe as its sphere; and in its eternal activity, and infinite variety, will surpass every conception that can be formed of it here

Without the tribulation, and without the patience, of the kingdom in Jesus4—save peradventure in sympathy with other worlds where patience may still share with love the honor of being the royal law—they will be for ever its ministering servants 1Revelation 21:2-3; 2Ephesians 1:23; 3Revelation 22:5; 4Revelation 1:9

IV. The consummation will not, however, merge the individual in the body corporate, any more than the body corporate will be merged in God. Eternal blessedness will be the portion of every soul in the innumerable company of the redeemed: that individual blessedness will be the perfection of the created nature of man, which, implying its deliverance from all evil, rests not short of its union with God, the Beatific Vision, and the fullness of the spirit’s satisfaction in the creaturely reflection of the Divine image

1. Negatively, eternal life will be in its final issues the absolute and perfect removal of every evil: that is to say, of the results of sin and the possibility of sinning. Every trace of this sojourner for a night will be effaced from body and soul and spirit: a consummation reserved for the heavenly state. And this negative fruition of rest and deliverance is itself the positive perfection of man according to the primitive constitution of human nature From the moment when the dust of the earth yielded to the Finger of God the material for the creation of its most perfect product, the human personality has never yet, save in Jesus, seen its highest estate: nor in Jesus upon earth. It will remain for heaven to blot out the last remembrances of the Fall. On the earth the sanctified

carry with them the results of past transgressions to the grave; in the intermediate world, though they see the King in His beauty1 with the eyes of the disembodied spirit, their bodily eyes see corruption.2 Only on admission into heaven will the Redeemer save the whole man: at His second coming shall He appear the second time without sin. UNTO SALVATION:3 unto that residuary salvation which will change the firstfruits of the Spirit4 into full redemption The temporal state with all its restrictions and infirmities will give place to an eternal from which these shall have vanished for ever. But salvation at the best is a negative term. We are lost, and it is our dignity to be capable of being conscious that we are lost, in the thought of our entering into an eternal state. The finite will be received into the bosom of infinity; time will be taken up into the bosom of eternity. The most blessed negative result of this will be that change or progression will be only and absolutely upward and forward. Development will continue, but without the possibility of lapse into evil: separation from God, which is sin, will be impossible for ever 1Isaiah 33:17; 2Psalms 49:9; 3Hebrews 9:28; 4Romans 8:23

2. But all this is only negative. There are some positive terms by which, hope is taught to define without definition its conception of eternal life. They rise in a sacred gradation from the vision of God to union with Him and the perfect reflection of His image in Christ Jesus for ever. This gradation marks the stages of the religious life on earth; but it will be perfected in the eternal state

(1.) The glorified saint will be admitted to the direct, intuitive VISION OF GOD, of the Triune God as revealed in Christ, the eternal Mediator of that vision. In this life we have the same vision, but yet We walk by faith, not by sight:1 these words describe the present estate of Christians, as opposed to that in which we shall be present with the Lord.2 St

John also tells us, when despairing of any other thing to say, that we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is.3 What the glorified Redeemer is now we know not: for in this world we see through a glass darkly.4 St.. Paul makes himself a representative of every saint in probation, even the most privileged, when he says: Now I know in part: but then shall I know even as also I am known.5 The vision of Christ is vouchsafed to faith now; but faith sees Him only as in- a mirror: receiving as in a glass the glory of the Lord.6 With His own face unveiled, and to the direct intuition of our unveiled faces, He cannot reveal Himself: that will be the prerogative of heaven. He is pleased indeed to use the same word to express our vision of Him here, emfanisoo autoo emauton, and the vision of Him in heaven emfanistheénai toó prosoópoo toú Theoú but the same vision will be seen by very different eyes. Whatever meaning the promise has for the present, its fullest meaning is for the future: Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.7 This is the BEATIFIC VISION of the Father in the Son of God in Christ, which the contemplation of faith now prepares for and longs for: no other than, the fulfillment of the Saviour’s request: that they may behold My glory.8

12 Corinthians 5:7-8; 21 John 3:2; 31 Corinthians 13:12; 42 Corinthians 3:18; 5John 19:21; 6Hebrews 9:24; 7Matthew 5:8; 8John 17:24

(2.) This vision implies a distinct personality, which will never be lost in God. But in a certain sense it must be lost in God, for the Saviour’s last prayer, which was really His last promise, was that they all may be one; as Thou Father art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us.1 Not content with this, He proceeded and said: I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in One. This union with God is, as we read, begun on earth: that the world may know that

Thou hast sent Me, and hast loved them, as Thou hast loved Me.2 Of such union as this there is no analogy on earth, nor among created things: it has its type in the Holy Trinity itself 1John 17:21; 2John 17:23

(3.) This is Eternal BLESSEDNESS: the term which Christian theology uses to express the utmost bliss of which the created spirit is capable in the vision and enjoyment of God, and in the pure, undimmed reflection of His image. Perfectly reflecting the image of the Eternal Image of the Father, we shall have reached our truest and fullest personal consummation: eita to telos, the spirit of man finds its rest in Him who is the principle and beginning of its life, being now the glorified realization of what Adam was in Paradise, with such a superadded union with the Son of God as Adam had not. Here is the final issue of the Redeemer's work of God in the soul of man: His own purity, the vision of God in Him, and perfect blessedness. Once more, this is but the consummation of what is begun on earth. In the spiritual vision of Himself, He enables us to purify our souls, even as He is pure,1 for we are changed into the same image, from glory to glory.2 And all who are thus transformed by grace shall be translated into the glory beyond. In our glorified bodies our glorified spirits will see God, and in that vision enjoy the eternal benediction of the pure in heart: we shall know that absolute blessedness to bestow which was the final end of the whole work of the Redeemer on earth:

God, having raised up His Servant, sent Him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.3 11 John 3:3; 22 Cor. 2:18; 3Acts 3:26 TO GOD ONLY WISE, BE GLORY THROUGH JESUS CHRIST FOR EVER. AMEN.1

1Romans 16:27

sermon index

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
- 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net